THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

There can be no doubt of the importance of the Barmen Declaration as an assertion of the freedom of the Christian Church, and our readers may be glad to be reminded of what exactly the Barmen Declaration was, and of its significance for the Christian Church outside of Germany as well as within that land.

They will find these matters expounded in a recent pamphlet[1] which contains (1) the Declaration of the Reich Synod of the German Confessional Church held in Barmen in May 1934; (2) an article by H. H. Kramm on the Barmen Declaration and the Church Universal; (3) an article by J. O. Cobham on the Significance of the Barmen Declaration for the Oecumenical Church.

As the Bishop of Chichester explains in the Foreword, the prophet of Barmen was Karl Barth, then Professor at Bonn. At the very start of the Nazi regime he plainly and clearly declared: 'What must now under no circumstances take place is that, in zeal for something which we regard as a good cause, we lose our theological existence. Our theological existence is our existence in the Church, and that, as appointed preachers and teachers of the Church.'

Karl Barth learned through time what National Socialism meant. It became no longer for him a 'good cause.' Writing from the relative, if precarious, security of neutral Switzerland, he attacked it as 'a new Islam, its myth as a new Allah, and Hitler as this new Allah's Prophet.' That, however, was an interpretation of National Socialism on the religious side very difficult for a loyal and patriotic German citizen to reach, and the German Evangelical Churchmen assembled at Barmen in 1934 could not be expected to have reached it.

But what had they to say in view of the national situation confronting them? What did they affirm, and what did they condemn? The 'German Christians' had welcomed the triumph of National Socialism in 1933 politically, as indeed had—or said they had—the men of Barmen. But they had also welcomed it theologically. As God had raised up Hitler for the redemption of the German people, the proclamation of this act of God must find its place, and that no small place, in the preaching of the Church.

The German Evangelical Churchmen assembled at Barmen, who belonged to a federation of the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches, were opposed to all attempts to unify the German Evangelical Church that did not come 'by the Word of God in faith through the Holy Spirit.' In the forefront of their Declaration against the errors of the 'German Christians' and the Reich Church Government, errors which really laid waste the German Evangelical Church and so broke up its unity, they placed the words that follow: 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me' (Jn 14^6). 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved' (Jn $10^{1.9}$).

'Jesus Christ, as He is testified to us in Holy Scripture, is the one Word of God which we have to hear and which we have to trust and obey in life and death. We reject the false doctrine that the Church can and must acknowledge as a source of its proclamation, beside and in addition to this one Word of God, other events, powers, forms, and truths as the revelation of God.'

Dr. Kramm says that the sentence just quoted leaves it open whether there might be a possibility of *recognizing* God in Nature, history, etc., or not; it only says that the *proclamation* of the Church, the actual message, preaching, and teaching must not be based on any other revelation than the revelation in Christ.

If this means that, in our preaching and teaching, we must take no cognisance of the knowledge of God revealed in the natural order, then many would with Mr. Cobham refuse assent to the statement of the Confessional Synod (in which the influence of Karl Barth is evident). It seems, however, to mean even more than this; it seems to deny that any knowledge of God is revealed in the natural order.

[1] *The Significance of the Barmen Declaration for the Oecumenical Church*, with a Foreword by the Bishop of Chichester (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net).

But the real point of Barmen was, as Mr. COBHAM goes on to indicate, not this negative attitude characteristic of Barthianism towards the knowledge of God to be found in the world of Nature and history, but to declare that, in the teaching of the 'German Christians,' the Christian religion had been identified with human knowledge and achievement, and 'God' had become only another word for 'man.'

Or as Pope Pius XI wrote in an Encyclical of 1937, 'Whoever transposes Race or People, the State or Constitution, the executive or other fundamental elements of human society (which in the natural order have an essential and honourable place) from the scale of earthly values and makes them the ultimate norm of all things, even of religious values, and deifies them in an idolatrous cult, perverts and falsifies the divinely created and appointed order of things.'

Mr. COBHAM thinks that the Church of England might learn something from the Barmen Declaration. As the Church of England includes many lay people whose religion is one of Nature or patriotism (the people who come to Church on Harvest Thanksgivings or on Days of National Prayer), there is a danger that there might arise out of them a movement of 'English Christians.' But he is not so much afraid of this as of the rise of a Neo-Paganism in some form or other. If it should arise, the Church would have to define the gospel afresh in the face of it. This is what the men of Barmen did in face of the Cult of Race and Blood, and for this we owe them gratitude.

A really valuable book has been published under the title of *Interpreters of Man*, by the Reverend Gwilym O. GRIFFITH.[1] It contains a series of short sketches of about twenty writers, mainly theological, from Hegel to Karl Barth, done with knowledge and skill. Merely to say that, however, would give but a poor impression of the aim and contents of the book.

A strong unifying thread runs through it all and gathers its various parts into an impressive whole. It is a study of modern views of man in their relation to the Christian doctrine. The writer originally intended to entitle his book 'The Decline of Renaissance Man,' and although he found reason to discard that title it very fitly describes the substance of the book, for in his view 'the period covering the various teachers and writers under review marks the last phase of Renaissance humanism.'

[1] Lutterworth Press; 15s. net.

What do we mean by Renaissance man? The name points to that wonderful flowering of human self-confidence which marked the period of the Renaissance. Man, who had long been taught to bow down to authority human and divine, began again to assert himself, to feel his native powers stirring within him, giving him a new confidence that he could fight his own battle unaided, that he was born to rule and not to serve.

This proud humanism, though it blossomed out at the Renaissance, is as old as history itself. It was the primal temptation in the Garden, 'Ye shall be as gods,' and such indeed has been the natural man's ambition and endeavour throughout the ages. Hebrew tradition tells of the strong, resourceful race of Cain surpassing in achievement the quiet, godfearing sons of Seth, of the building of Towers of Babel and mighty unblest empires; while Greek tradition records how the giants piled Ossa on Pelion in their proud attempt to storm the battlements of heaven, and warns against that *hybris* which lifts a man up to his destruction. In profoundest contrast to all that is the Bible doctrine of man, which consistently presents him as indeed a godlike but fallen and sinful creature, needing mercy and grace to help in time of need, whose duty therefore is to remember his frailty and walk humbly with his God.

At the Renaissance the humanistic spirit was in the ascendant and, for good or ill, created the modern world. Its achievements in every department of human enterprise have been unsurpassed. The only question which now begins to press upon us is whether modern civilization may not prove to have been the greatest Tower of Babel that ever was built. Such a doubt, however, is of recent date.

The nineteenth century shared to the full the Renaissance faith in the innate capacity and exalted destiny of the natural man. It found in the doctrine of evolution a thought-form highly fitted to express this faith. Human history was seen as an upward progress which might confidently be expected to continue without measurable limits. Man was to be regarded as a heroic being who had constantly aspired and steadily climbed up the long ascent till now he stood upon the summit, looking out upon vast horizons and hailing the sunrise of a more glorious day. All the current literature showed in some degree the influence of this spirit, and the popular exponents of the doctrine break out into lyrical strains of optimism which sound strangely in our ears to-day.

It may be said in passing that the reaction against this naturalistic optimism has not only

set in but is now running with a strong current. Many of its votaries are bitterly disillusioned. Take the notable case of H. G. Wells. He was wont to predict the time when men as gods 'will stand on this earth as on a footstool and reach out their hands among the stars.' 'Man must go on—conquest beyond conquest. This little planet and its winds and ways, and all the laws of mind and matter that restrain him. Then the planets about him, and at last out across immensity to the stars.' Now grown old and weary with another world-war, he makes the sad confession, 'In spite of all my disposition to a brave-looking optimism, I perceive that now the universe is bored with man, is turning a hard face to him, and I see him being carried less and less intelligently and more and more rapidly . . . along the stream of fate to degradation, suffering and death.'

On theology the influence of the Renaissance was profound. It led to a depreciation of doctrine and an exaltation of the free critical spirit. The Christian view of man was expressly repudiated or silently ignored. In the record of human progress there was no room for a Fall, and evil was to be regarded as good in the making. Man was no sinner standing in need of redemption, but a progressive being destined to further development. Instead of seeking help from on high let him trust and exert his native genius to the full and all would be well. For Christ, reverence as the best of men; nor hesitate to call Him divine, for all men, each in his own degree, are divine. Such was the general trend of thought.

There were not wanting voices to challenge it. Early in the century Kierkegaard had uttered his protest, but in terms so strange that it fell upon unhearing ears. More recently it has been taken up again by Karl Barth and those associated with his school and made to resound throughout the Christian world, like the cathedral bell (in Barth's own simile) which awakes a sleeping city. The substance of this protest is now sufficiently familiar. It utters a most emphatic No! to the whole humanistic doctrine of man. It sees him under the judgment of God, unable of himself to will and to do the right. If ever he is to be saved the initiative must come from above; he has no claim nor fitness to receive; his very power of response is God-given. Man at his best and all his works lie under divine judgment and must be redeemed by grace.

While acknowledging the value of this ruthless exposure of humanism Mr. GRIFFITH goes on to criticize Barthianism as being one-sided and leaving important elements of truth out of sight. It is not enough simply to condemn all the ways and works of men as being under the judgment of God, as though all were alike worthless and of no account. We must recognize a world of law and order which though not perfect is incomparably better than its opposite, and is therefore deserving of our active loyalty and support. As if Barth was not fully aware of all that and strenuously upheld it both in theory and in practice! Barth is no quietest who simply leaves a sinful world to the sovereign mercies of God, and who sees no shades in the universal black. Who has been a more courageous and active opponent of Nazism in the interest of freedom and social order? And to-day he wears the uniform of the Swiss Home Guard. In his Gifford Lectures also (lecture 19) he treats at length of 'the State's Service to God,' and there says, 'If we were to refuse to do our duty as citizens, we should be denying God just as much as if we were to disavow our Confession in the Church. . . . We may neither pray nor wish to be spared obedience to God in this worldly sphere either, to be spared the political service of God as such. And since we now have been claimed for it, we may not take flight from any of its consequences demanded of us. The world needs men, and it would be sad if it were just the Christians who did not wish to be men.'

Canon Charles E. RAVEN's last book, *Good News of God*,[1] is one of the most interesting and attractive he has written. For most readers it will be an entrancing experience to read it. Not for all. Not for the 'Neo-Calvinists' or certain other persons and institutions against whom and which Dr. RAVEN writes 'violently'! He does so because they petrify and belittle the gospel, and his whole soul is in the statement of it—its breadth, its humanity, its realism.

For its full statement of the gospel this is a great book. And for much else, particularly for two things—his own humble autobiographical revelations and the way and extent of his reconciliation of science and religion. For Dr. RAVEN is, of course, not only a notable theologian but also an expert scientist, fully engaged in biological and other scientific investigations and definitely 'seized' by the scientific outlook.

The three things that are outstanding in this book are, first, Dr. RAVEN's doctrine of God, second, his own experience of conversion and, finally, his unsparing attack on the present-day Church for its narrowness, pettiness, and obscurantism. The first is the most important, and some

[1] Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net.

account of it must at all costs be given, whatever happens to two and three.

One of Dr. RAVEN's deepest convictions is that God is to be found everywhere. We are to see 'the gospel' not as the last desperate remedy of an otherwise defeated God, nor as a divine (but still desperate) invasion of a world successfully rebellious, nor as indeed in any sense an intrusion *ab extra* of an alien Deity, but as the fulfilment at its appointed season of the loving purpose of the Father. We rejoice to trace in the long story of evolution the gradual unfolding of His purpose, in human history the closer preparation for the Christ.

Christ is the crown of creation. 'I should find it impossible to believe in the divinity of Christ or in any doctrine of incarnation if I were compelled to deny the religious value of flowers and birds and of the natural order. If, as I believe, the character of God is "testified to by the things that He has made," if in flower and bird there is some faint reflection of the divine beauty and order and goodness, if we may find in the story of creative evolution a true "preparation for the Gospel," then it is natural to confess that the fullness of God's self-manifestation to us men has been given in the perfect Son of Man, and that St. Paul's definition of the divine purpose as "to sum up all things in Christ, both things in heaven and things on earth" has been fulfilled.'

This is the uncompromising doctrine of the whole purpose of God—God in creation (everywhere and always), in flower and bird; God in evolution, with Christ as its crown; God in history, with Christ as its fulfilment; God fully in Christ. Christ is therefore not an alien ('breaking in upon the fallen world from outside'). If He were, He would be unintelligible, mythical, 'from our standpoint monstrous.'

But, of course, a 'Nature-faith' such as the belief in God's presence in Nature, is not enough. It fails to deal with our real problems, and especially the problem of sin. And not only is it not enough, it is only one part of the truth. The truth is found in Christ and in His Cross, not the Cross alone but the Cross with the life and with the teaching. One of the finest chapters in this book is on 'The Fact of Christ,' with its passionate faith in the Saviour and in the gift of God in Him.

All this is summed up and stated with great power in the last chapter on 'The Purpose of God.' In the gospel, thus expounded, says Dr. RAVEN is the clue to all history, a real *weltanschauung*. There is first the creative purpose, leading up to Christ; then, a process, incomplete in itself but pregnant; further, God as an actor or partner in the drama; and because of this the end is sure.

And the doctrine of the Holy Spirit binds all into a solid structure. If the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is ignored, the doctrine of creation becomes merely the tale of a bit of carpentry, incarnation becomes a theophany and all possibility of interpreting or imitating Christ becomes absurd, and atonement becomes magic. This is the secret we must recapture, the experience of the power of the Holy Spirit—to rediscover the secret of Pentecost, the experience of life 'in the Spirit' and the outlook upon the universe which that life involves.

As we have indicated, Dr. RAVEN tells us how he arrived at this great faith. His work as a scientist, his admiration for the scientific outlook, his pre-occupation with Nature and its problems, along with his own religious standpoint, probably accounts for his almost passionate belief in the God who is near us in His works as the foundation of all his later faith. But the traditional faith which he had been taught went to pieces, as it has done in other cases.

And then came his 'conversion.' It was a gradual thing, in three stages. First was the establishing of the historical evidence for the fact of Christ. Then there was the question of Christ's influence. Was it real, this changing of lives, these conversions of men like Paul? Or was it suggestion or superstition? It was Paul who assured him on this point, Paul's character and his brilliant gifts. Here was a real man describing real things. And then came the third stage when he realised that this wonderful influence was an experienced fact. The fact he had studied in others began to take place in himself. A vivid consciousness of the living presence of Christ, an intense and releasing devotion to Him, a feeling that the whole world had become new, a resolve to let this experience control all his activities—this became his possession.

'I know whom I have believed'—'however much I forget or forsake these words, they are at bottom the thing I hold most certain, the thing that has remained with me when death seemed only a matter of seconds, the thing that gives meaning and worth to all else.' Thus he describes his religious assurance. And it is easy to see how his 'Nature faith' and his 'Christ faith' have become one and the clue to Nature, history, and grace.

S. John i.–iii.: A Study in Dislocations.

By the Reverend Canon E. Basil Redlich, M.A., B.D., Little Bowden, Market Harborough.

The hypothesis of accidental dislocations of the leaves of a papyrus codex, a parent MS. from which all extant forms of the Fourth Gospel are derived, has been advanced to explain difficulties in the Gospel which arise (1) from discontinuity of thought in the discourses and (2) from inconsistencies in the route of the journeys which our Lord made in His ministry. Modern discoveries of codices such as the Chester Beatty papyri and of fragments of leaves of codices are evidence that books, as distinct from rolls, of the Old and New Testaments existed before A.D. 150 and that therefore accidental displacements are possible. One of the 12 Chester Beatty codices, that of the Gospels and Acts, consists of 30 mutilated leaves out of a possible 110 and is made up of quires of two leaves or four pages placed one after another in succession. Others of the 12 volumes have quires of 10 or 12 leaves. The only possibility for the chance transference of single leaves is a format of single sheets of papyrus pasted together or fastened without being folded, the paste or fastening having decayed or having been destroyed in course of time.

Scholars who have favoured the theory, *e.g.* Warburton Lewis, Thompson, and Bernard, agree that the most likely number of Greek letters on a single leaf of the parent codex varies from 730 to 750, say 734–6 letters. This leaf index satisfies most of the suggested dislocations. For example, 3^{22-30} has 733 letters, ch. 5 has 3622, 7^{15-24} has 762, 8^{12-20} has 730, 10^{1-18} has 1481 and so on. The Greek text from which the numbers are obtained is that of Westcott and Hort.

We propose in this article to deal with dislocations in chapters 1–3 only of the Fourth Gospel, and to apply a more rigorous test of measurement than has hitherto been the case. To the present writer the conditions for accidental displacement are as follows, conditions 2–5 being the mathematical test:

1. The internal evidence must be strong.
2. Passages dislocated must fill a complete leaf or leaves (not page or pages) and be written on *recto* and *verso*.
3. The number of letters on a leaf, or the leaf index, must prevail in all dislocated passages.
4. The bottom of the page preceding the dislocated passage must be the conclusion of the sense-section which precedes the dislocation, and a leaf or leaves of the sense-section preceding the dislocation must be a multiple of the leaf index.
5. The chapters and verses which intervene between any two dislocated passages must be multiples of the leaf index.

We begin by considering the section 3^{22-30}. The opening Greek words of $v.^{22}$ in ch. 3, μετὰ ταῦτα, indicate the beginning of a set of reminiscences. The same Greek words introduce chs. 5, 6, and 7. Therefore 3^{22} to the end of ch. 4 might have been dictated by the Evangelist at one sitting. We proceed to examine how much of this whole section is in chronological sequence to 3^{21}. Internal considerations favour the transference of 3^{22-30} to a position immediately after 2^{12}. This internal evidence is of two kinds, geographical and contextual.

The geographical statements concerned are these:

2^{12}. After this (the wedding at Cana) he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren and his disciples: and there they abode not many days.

2^{13}. And the passover of the Jews was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

3^{22}. After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa; and there he tarried with them, and baptized.

The itinerary in the order of the text describes a journey from Cana to Capernaum, thence after a short interval to Jerusalem, and finally from Jerusalem into the land of Judæa. Had the route been from Capernaum into the land of Judæa and then to Jerusalem, there would have been no inconsistency but to say that they 'came into the land of Judæa' from Jerusalem is as inconsequential as saying that travellers from Glasgow went to London and from thence came into England. If then 3^{22} followed 2^{12}, the sequence would read reasonably. In fact, the passage which needs to be dislocated is not 3^{22-30}, as suggested by many scholars, but 2^{13}–3^{21}. In this case, Jesus journeys from Capernaum (2^{12}) to the land of Judæa (3^{22}) where He baptizes. There Jesus, knowing that the Pharisees were growing suspicious of Him because He 'was making and baptizing more disciples than John,' leaves Judæa and returns to Galilee *via* Samaria (ch. 4). No visit is paid to Jerusalem.

The context of 3^{22-30} also favours the sequence 2^{13}, 3^{22}. For in the story of the sign performed at Cana at a marriage feast and in the section 3^{22-30}, there are many points of contact. The references to the marriage and the bridegroom in Cana seem connected with the Baptist's words, 'He that hath the bride is the bridegroom' (3^{29}); the disciples in 2^{12} are referred to in 3^{22}, and the purifying in 2^{6} comes up again 'in the questioning on the part of John's disciples with a Jew about purifying' (3^{25}).

If we take 2^{12}–3^{21} as a dislocation, our next step is the application of our mathematical test. The following figures are suggestive:

1^{1-18} (The Prologue)	=1122 letters or 2 leaves, allowance being made for a space at the beginning of the Gospel.
1^{19}–2^{12}	$=3651$ letters $=5\times743-19$
2^{13}–3^{21}	$=2836$ letters $=4\times734-100$
3^{22-30}	$=733$

The figures show that all the conditions of our calculus are satisfied. 2^{13}–3^{21} and 3^{22-30} both comply with the leaf index and therefore not only 3^{22-30} but also 2^{13}–3^{20} can be dislocated. If we take 2^{13}–3^{20} as the dislocation, 3^{22} automatically follows 2^{12}. The argument is strengthened by the fact that 1^{19}–2^{12} goes on 5 complete leaves and *v.* 2^{12} therefore ends at the bottom of a page.

Another conclusion to be drawn from this rearrangement and the figures given above is that 3^{31-36} is not part of the Johannine commentary on the words of Jesus to Nicodemus.

We must next consider the problem of the displacement of 2^{13}–3^{21}. Whence was it displaced? What was its original position?

This section of 4 leaves of the parent codex contains the incidents of the Cleansing of the Temple and of the visit of Nicodemus to Jesus prior to a Passover festival. The incidents are connected and clearly formed a pair of stories which circulated together and were related to each other in point of time. This is also evident mathematically.

The Cleansing of the Temple and the summary	=1065 letters
The Visit of Nicodemus (3^{1-21})	=1771 ,,
	2836 = 4 leaves

Neither of these by itself is a multiple of 734–6, our leaf index, and neither could therefore have been written on a complete leaf or two complete leaves.

When we examine the internal evidence, certain considerations favour the view that the whole section 2^{13}–3^{21} is far from being appropriately placed after 2^{12}. Nicodemus came to Jesus by night, an action which suggests a period of the ministry when secrecy was advisable and when it was expedient that a timid ruler of the Jews should visit Jesus not openly but under cover of darkness. The timorousness of Nicodemus is evident from his action before the Sanhedrin (7^{50-52}). There he does not openly side with Jesus but rests his expostulation on mere procedure. Again, the ruler in his opening remarks mentions 'the signs' performed by Jesus in Jerusalem and which were common knowledge. And yet in the order of the traditional text there is only one sign preceding the visit, namely that at Cana, a sign done not in public in Jerusalem but at a domestic event in a Galilean town. The second sign that Jesus did is recorded in 4^{54}. Further, in the Hebrew trial of Jesus, the charge laid against Him of uttering words about the destruction of the Temple implies that the utterance attributed to Him was made at a time not far distant from that of the trial.

It will therefore be useful to test the contexts of recorded visits of Jesus to Jerusalem for the Passover. In the Fourth Gospel, apart from 2^{13}, two passovers are mentioned, the first after the Feeding of the Five Thousand which we are not told Jesus attended and have no right to assume He did, and the second in our Lord's final visit to Jerusalem. The ideal place for the dislocation is undoubtedly the second reference, for then Johannine chronology would be in harmony with the Synoptic, and both would agree not only on the length of the ministry but also that Jesus during His ministry visited Jerusalem once and once only, namely that during which He was crucified.

Jn 12^{37-43}, coming at the close of the first part of the Gospel, contains the final evangelistic summing up of the ministry of Jesus as far as the Passion. In this summary, the mention of 'many signs' performed by Jesus, and of rulers who 'believed on him' but through fear of expulsion from the synagogue 'did not confess it,' makes the transposition of 2^{12}–3^{21} to a position in ch. 12 very relevant. We cannot do better than quote the course of events and the summaries of the Evangelist which ensue when 2^{13}–3^{21} is placed after 12^{36}.

After the Raising of Lazarus.

$11^{54f.}$. Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews, but departed thence into the country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim; and there he tarried with the disciples.

Now the passover of the Jews was at hand: and many went up to Jerusalem out of the country before the passover, to purify themselves.

12^{1}. Jesus therefore six days before the passover came to Bethany.

The Triumphal Entry.

12^{12}. On the morrow a great multitude that had come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, . . . went forth to meet him.

12^{36}. These things spake Jesus, and he departed and hid himself from them.

The Cleansing of the Temple and the Visit of Nicodemus.

2^{13}. And the passover of the Jews was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

$2^{23f.}$. Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, during the feast, many believed on his name, beholding his signs which he did. But Jesus did not trust himself unto them.

3^{1}. Now there was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came unto him by night.

12^{37}. But though he had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on him.

$12^{42f.}$. Nevertheless even of the rulers many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God.

We have seen reason for the irrelevance of 2^{13}–3^{21} in its position in the traditional text. But when we place the section after 12^{36} not only is it found compatible with the conditions and circumstances described in chs. 11 and 12 but ambiguities in ch. 12 are removed.

1. The appropriateness of our Lord's words to Nicodemus if spoken on the eve of the Passion is self-evident. 'And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up.' 'For God so loved the world, that he gave (up) his only begotten Son.' The teaching on the Spirit (3^{5-8}), is to be followed by fuller teaching in the upper room.

2. The appropriateness of the teaching on baptism in ch. 3 with the Feet Washing in ch. 13, and especially with the words 'He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit,' the first leading up to the second.

3. The mention of 'many signs' in 2^{23} and 12^{37} and the absence of the mention of a single sign in the passover visit of 2^{12} is resolved. We cannot explain away the statement of 2^{23} by saying that there were many signs done in Jerusalem of which the Evangelist was unaware or which he did not record here. The interest of the Evangelist in Judæa takes precedence over the ministry in Galilee, and in every visit of our Lord to Jerusalem he either relates an incident or a discourse. It is therefore difficult to understand why, if 2^{13} recorded the first visit of our Lord to Jerusalem, no sign or discourse is related. The section must therefore have been displaced from its true context not accidentally but purposely by the copyist or editor for some good reason, which might be discovered.

4. Another difficulty that is cleared up is the absence of any hint in 13^{1} of our Lord's return to Jerusalem after He had hidden Himself as related in 12^{36}.

5. The repeated emphasis laid on this passover visit in the passages quoted above are impressive. It seems as if the Evangelist desired to prepare his readers, from the memories of those critical days, of the only passover which Jesus attended during His ministry but of which actual feast our Lord did not partake.

6. The paragraph referring to the rulers in $12^{42f.}$ which seems uncalled for after 12^{37} is given significance if the visit of Nicodemus preceded it.

7. The second summing up by the Evangelist of the teaching of our Lord in 12^{44-50} has points of contact with the story of Nicodemus, *e.g.* the reference to light and darkness, life eternal and believing on Jesus and rejecting Him.

8. Lastly, we have the evidence of 7^{50} in the phrase, 'he that came to him before, being one of them.' The phrase is omitted in one of the important uncial manuscripts, and the suspicious word πρότερον (formerly) in three other manuscripts. The term 'formerly' clearly indicates that the phrase is a gloss inserted by the editor who has transferred 2^{13}–3^{21} from ch. 12 to follow 2^{12}.

9. The text of $4^{1f.}$ bears indications that it has been 'tampered with.' The use of ὁ κύριος (the Lord) is peculiar. Bernard says of *v.*[1] that 'it is clumsily expressed and seems to have been rewritten' and of *v.*[2] that the style is not Johannine. Thus the tampering with the text is to be seen adjacent to the point where the dislocation has been made, that is, near to the Nicodemus incident. The editor responsible for the dislocation would not allow that Jesus Himself baptized and therefore inserted a clause in *v.*[2] to that effect, even if by so doing he contradicted the Evangelist ($3^{22.\ 26}$). He again in 7^{22} did not hesitate to contradict the Evangelist's report of our Lord's teaching on the origin of circumcision by adding the words 'not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers.'

The stringent mathematical test laid down above favours the transference of 2^{13}–3^{21} to follow 12^{36}. To satisfy this test, not only must 2^{13}–3^{21} be a multiple of our leaf-index, but so must 12^{1-26} be. Now $12^{1-36} = 2976$ letters $= 4 \times 734 + 40$ and thus satisfies our conditions. Also condition (5) given above is satisfied for chs. 1–11 contain 38127 letters which is $733 \times 52 + 11$. It may be recalled that in the format of papyrus codices, a quire formed of 2 leaves was one of the methods in use. For the section under consideration, which is 4 leaves in extent, no necessity exists for adopting the hypothesis that our parent codex might have been made up of single sheets of papyrus pasted together like a modern writing-pad.

We may therefore conclude that there is good and sound reason for placing 2^{13}–3^{21} after 12^{36}, that is during our Lord's one and only visit to Jerusalem during the ministry after the Triumphal Entry. The two incidents of the Cleansing of the Temple and of the visit of Nicodemus find a fitting place after ch. 11 and immediately after 12^{36}. The closing verses of ch. 11 are an appropriate and dramatic preparation for the scene in the Temple. 'Many went up to Jerusalem . . . to purify themselves. They sought therefore for Jesus, and spake one with another, as they stood in the temple, What think ye? That he will not come to the feast?' The pilgrims go up to purify themselves; Jesus goes up to purify His Father's house. The visit of Nicodemus too is apt after the private discussion in the Sanhedrin when they took counsel that they might put Jesus to death (11^{53}), 'for this man doeth many signs.' And one of these signs which impressed them and Nicodemus was the raising of Lazarus from the dead.

The dislocated passage was not placed after 2^{12} as the result of an accident but was the deliberate act of the copyist or editor. It was possibly placed there for theological reasons. The Gospel according to S. John is sacramental throughout, and of the two great sacraments the Evangelist placed the Eucharist first in order of importance. This is clear from the sacramental symbolism of 19^{34}, 'howbeit one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and straightway there came out blood and water.' Blood is mentioned first. But to the copyist or editor, the new life began with baptism. As a churchman he believed that the teaching on the sacraments should follow the natural and logical order—initiation into the fellowship of the Church first, the maintenance of the life of fellowship second.

We conclude that the internal evidence, together with the objective test of measurement, and the evidence of a known format of 2 leaves and the tampering of the text in $4^{1f.}$—a four-fold argument—is very strongly in favour of the argument for an editor's transference of this one section from its original position in ch. 12 to its present position in the traditional text.

Literature.

THE MIND OF CHRIST.

STUDENTS of the New Testament, and more especially 'critical' students of the Synoptic Gospels, should be interested in the publication of the Cunningham Lectures delivered in 1940 at New College, Edinburgh, by Professor William Manson, D.D., of the Chair of New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology in the University of Edinburgh. The Lectures are entitled, *Jesus the Messiah* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), and sub-titled, 'The Synoptic Tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ: with special reference to Form-Criticism.'

The promise in the sub-title is well fulfilled. The Lecturer analyses the Synoptic tradition and presses behind it in order to discover the character of 'the mind regarding God and man' in which Christianity originated. (He admits, however, that we do not know when or where 'the Messianic consciousness' of Jesus first found expression.) Further, in thus seeking to get behind the Synoptic tradition he enlists the special help of the Form-Critics, of R. Bultmann in particular; refusing, however, to travel all the way with him in his historical scepticism—or for that matter, with Reitzenstein in his Christological idealism.

It appears indeed to be the burden of the Lectures that while the Synoptic tradition in Christology owes not a little to the thought and life of the post-resurrection Church, it is essentially an expression and embodiment of the mind of Jesus Himself. 'This glow or aureole in which the glory of the Risen Lord blends to some extent with the lineaments of the Jesus of history does not mean that the image of Jesus as He was on earth is so refracted as no longer to appear in its reality.' The 'glow' or 'aureole,' in so far as it was of extraneous origin, itself underwent a 'total change' (is 'total' the *mot juste*?) in being appropriated to Jesus. For 'the real background of the mind of Jesus was not Jewish apocalyptic or ethnic gnosis but the prophetic religion of the Old Testament.'

A notable feature of the Lectures is the way in which the Synoptic tradition is set against its prophetic background in the Old Testament. On two Synoptic passages, it may be here remarked, Dr. Manson appears to throw fresh light by comparing them with certain passages in the Septuagint: namely, Mt $5^{39\text{-}40}$ and Lk 6^{29} as compared with Is $50^{6.\ 8}$; and Mt 5–7 as compared with Is 61. Under the first Synoptic passage the problem is raised of the 'original colouring' of the saying about non-resistance to evil; under the second, the suggestion made that the Sermon on the Mount may have been originally a commentary by Jesus on the evangelical prophet's vision.

The impression must not be conveyed that this book would be a happy hunting-ground for textual exposition. The book is too much concerned with 'critical' questions for that. Learned, scholarly, rich in penetrating analysis, and characterized

by a scientific precision of method (reinforced by a clear, logical, and forcible style), it handles the Synoptic tradition firmly and patiently with all the aid furnished by recent research; but even in so doing, it inevitably reveals the growing complexity of the modern interpreter's task.

A generation ago, before the rise of 'Eschatologism' and Form-Criticism, Dr. James Denney found the task of interpretation sufficiently difficult; it is much more difficult now.

As for the plan of the Lectures before us, the attempt is made to segregate and, as far as possible, consider by themselves the various strata or levels of tradition contained in the Synoptic material. First are considered the 'signs' or 'mighty works' of Jesus, on which at the simplest level of Christian preaching the revelation of God in Christ principally turns. It would be a mistake, says Dr. Manson, to think that in the tradition the teacher was metamorphosed into a wonder-worker. The teaching of Jesus is then considered, both in its religious and in its moral aspect, and both in its historical context and in its intrinsic content as a religious and moral absolute. Then are considered the chief Messianic titles or categories ('Son of God,' 'Servant of the Lord,' 'Son of Man') through which from the beginning the person of the worker and teacher was interpreted. The passion and death of Jesus is also considered, and it is maintained that this event determined more than anything else the conception held by the early Christian mind of the revelation of God in Christ, and that we may find here the influence of the mind of Jesus Himself.

In the Epilogue, in which Dr. Manson stands back a little from the details of the Synoptic tradition and, incidentally, gives himself the chance of showing a freer and more consecutive style, the historical character of the Church's gospel is strongly emphasized. It was Jesus who created the Messianic hope of the disciples. It was Jesus who turned 'eschatology' into a sign or token of inner transformation. And so on.

Included among the Appendices is a careful examination of the Heavenly Man Redemption Myth. W. FULTON.

THE THREE MEN.

It was Oliver Wendell Holmes who started the hare about the three men, John as he saw himself, John as other people saw him, and John as his Maker saw him. Young John, who was at the table when this analysis was made, appropriated the three peaches on a dish saying, 'there was just one for each of him.'

Mr. Norman Nicholson has led the hare along another way in his book, *Man and Literature* (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net). Political Man, Natural Man, and Imperfect Man is his analysis, and he contends that modern literature has three periods, corresponding roughly to these three categories, the period dominated by Shaw and Wells, the period of which the characteristic writers were D. H. Lawrence and Hemingway, and the most recent period with perhaps the dominating personalities T. H. Eliot and James Joyce. The periods are only roughly chronological, as they overlap and even co-exist, but speaking broadly they can be distinguished. The two first periods, or at least the attempts at explaining man in these periods, are, as Mr. Nicholson says, both simplifications of the nature of man, attempts to explain his being and purpose on one plane—in the first case (that of political or liberal man) by reason and in the light of assured progress, in the second place (that of natural man) by his animal desires. But the traditional view is that man lives on two planes, the material and spiritual, that his being and purpose are to be measured by a plan or will outside him and that his actions are to be judged by transcendent values. In other words, Shaw and Wells and Lawrence are united in rejecting original sin, but there is a literature coming into prominence and influence which revives the traditional view, and the war has assisted it by helping to show the insufficiency of a purely Pelagian conception of man. It is too soon to predict the size of this movement towards the right, but at any rate it has some powerful representatives.

Such is the main drift of a remarkably interesting and rewarding book which contains acute and well-conceived studies of writers like Shaw, Wells, Lawrence, Hemingway, Eliot, Joyce, Kafka, Galsworthy, Bennett, and T. F. Powys, to mention only the more prominent. These pages are made more interesting by copious extracts from the works criticised. This will make the book specially valuable to those who have not read much of the writers discussed, for Mr. Nicholson justifies his criticisms by his generous quotations. He possesses a rich and cultured mind and a spacious outlook. While we are reading his book we are conscious of moving among big concerns and in a large area of thought. It should be added that, while he is by no means narrowly traditional in his creed, his standpoint is definitely Christian. F. J. RAE.

THE ATONEMENT.

Signs multiply that Systematic Theology is coming into its own again. Here is a really significant book on *The Cross and the Eternal Order*, by the Rev. Henry W. Clark, D.D. (Lutterworth Press; 14s. net). The writer shows his competence in this field by a very wide and profound knowledge of the relevant literature, both ancient and modern. He begins by insisting that in studying the Atonement we must endeavour to take 'God's point of view,' not perhaps a very happy phrase. He means that Christ in His person and work must have a cosmic significance. Here is something not simply enacted within the human sphere, or to be judged merely by its influence on man. If the Cross is what the Church has found it to be it must be the very central act of the cosmic drama. Dr. Clark goes further and maintains, rightly as we think, that the Christian faith with its doctrine of the Trinity offers a philosophy of its own—*nostra philosophia*, as

Augustine called it, which is more adequate than any other, and in particular which bridges the gulf between the Absolute and the relative, the One and the many, which has been a bugbear in metaphysics and Unitarianism, as Martineau confessed. Accordingly 'Christian thinking may well speak with authoritative tones, and, claiming to be a satisfying philosophy in itself, feel itself discharged from any need of "reconciliations" with non-Christian philosophies of every shade. . . . It is a lesson the Christian Church, particularly those of her children who stand forth as defenders of her faith, greatly need to learn.' In dealing with Christ's atoning work Dr. Clark is profoundly influenced by St. Paul's picture in Colossians of *Christus Creator* becoming *Christus Redemptor* to initiate by His creative energy a return movement of humanity to God. Everyone will not agree with his way of putting it, for the mystery lies deeper than human speech, but undoubtedly he has made a really valuable contribution to the whole subject by a wealth of thoughtful criticisms of current theories of the Atonement, and it should be added that he writes in a fervent and deeply devout spirit. His book deserves to be read and pondered, for there is a spaciousness about it which encourages an exalted view of redemption. It would prove a stimulating subject for discussion in a theological club. J. H. MORRISON.

Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney is minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, and is widely known in America as a preacher and writer. His latest book, entitled *Great Nights of the Bible* (Abingdon-Cokesbury; $1.50) contains twelve sermons on Scripture incidents which occurred at night. The preacher's style is pictorial and dramatic. He can paint scenes with considerable imaginative power. With this he combines a fervent evangelical spirit and a real homiletic gift. The sermons, amply illustrated with literary allusions and modern parallels, are interesting to read, and one can imagine that when delivered they would make a powerful appeal.

One of the members of Sherbrooke Church in Glasgow, of which the Rev. George J. Jeffrey, B.D., is minister, was overheard to say 'there cannot be better preaching in Glasgow than we get Sunday by Sunday.' Mr. Jeffrey will now reach a larger public, for his second volume of sermons has been published by Messrs. James Clarke & Co. The title is *Christian Resources* (6s. net). There are twenty sermons in all on a great variety of subjects from both the Old and the New Testaments. This collection has got the qualities which marked the first volume, but in even greater strength. The thought is modern and arresting and is made memorable by the use of good illustrations.

We have given one of the sermons, in shortened form, in 'The Christian Year' this month. We would hazard the guess that readers will not be content with the thought of one sermon but will want the volume in its entirety.

Church, State and Letters, by the Rev. F. Brompton Harvey (Epworth Press; 6s. net), contains about a dozen articles, most of which appeared first in 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review.' It may be said with emphasis that they well deserve to be reprinted and preserved in more permanent form, for they contain much solid and indeed brilliant work. The first three are concerned with the Church. Their titles are Methodism and the Romantic Movement, the Necessity of the Church, the Three Rs of Methodism, and each in its own way is wholesome and heartening. In particular the influence which Methodism had on the Romantic Movement is strikingly brought out. The second section of the book, dealing with the State, contains four papers on the British Constitution, Roman and British Character, French and English, Might and Right, all of them thoughtful and thought-provoking. The last section on Letters is more varied in content and deals with such subjects as Erasmus, Thomas More, Thomas Hardy, John Morley, and others. The book throughout is a sheer delight to read, and one to which the reader will return with pleasure.

Some pamphlets may be mentioned for the intrinsic importance of their subjects. *The Proving of Things Not Seen*, by the Rev. F. A. Farley, M.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 6d.) is an earnest and helpful series of exercises in the practice of God's presence. *What the Christian Faith offers to the Jews that is not found in Judaism*, by the Rev. Ernest Sitenhof, B.A., B.D. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 4d.), will interest those who are concerned in the Jewish problem or Jewish missions. *Modernism and Youth*, by Mr. A. Clifford Hall, M.A. (Union of Modern Free Churchmen; 6d.), is an interpretation of Christianity on modernist lines.

Awakening Words, by the Rev. John Stevens, D.D., and Sarah Foster Mercy Stevens (Independent Press; 2s. net), is described in the subtitle as 'a Christian pilgrim's day-by-day book of guidance and cheer.' No attempt is made to follow the Christian year or to distinguish the days of the week. The days of the month are simply numbered and a brief sentiment of an evangelical type is given under each heading. There are no quotations, the writers having drawn entirely from their own resources. Without any special distinction of style their words are wholesome and stimulating.

The Book Still Speaks, by the Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, D.D. (Independent Press; 2s. net), contains over twenty children's addresses on Old Testament texts. These addresses are perhaps not so bright and imaginative as children's sermons often are, but on the other hand they avoid the snare of frivolity and fancifulness into which preachers to children sometimes fall. They are

serious expositions of Bible stories, told in language suitable to the young and calculated to make serious impressions on mind and heart.

The Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz, has continued his edition of the Jewish Prayer Book with a volume dealing with the Sabbath services—*The Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, Part II. (National Council for Jewish Religious Education, London). It is marked by all those features which we have learnt to expect from Dr. Hertz—scholarship, simple exposition, and deep religious feeling. The introductory note on the meaning and value of the Sabbath will be of special value to those who do not fully understand what the sacred day means to the devout Jew.

The Religious Education Press has published an extraordinarily good book of lessons for the infant department on *Jesus and His Friends*. The notes have been written by well-known experts of whom Miss Mary Entwistle is perhaps most familiar to teachers. There is the whole apparatus for a good lesson under each subject—story, background information, practical work, illustrations. Nothing could be better. The only fault to be found with such books is that they do the whole thing for the teacher, but for conscientious teachers this will not do much harm and it will certainly enrich the class lesson. It should be said that this book is a sequel to 'Stories of God and Jesus,' and that the full address of the publishers is 'The Religious Education Press Ltd., 85 Manor Road, Wallington, Surrey.' The price of the book is 5s. in cloth boards and 4s. 6d. in paper covers.

The most recent of the 'Needs of To-day' series is an answer to the question: *Does Sex Morality Matter?* It is by Dr. David R. Mace, who is an M.A., a B.Sc., and a Ph.D. (Rich & Cowan; 5s. net). There have been many books written on this subject in recent times but none better than this, one is tempted to say none so good. Every aspect of the sex problem, and the many questions it raises, is discussed here with frankness, knowledge, common sense, and from a Christian standpoint. The author was instructed to produce a reasoned defence of the standards of chastity and fidelity, to be practical and to relate his subject to life. He has done this and far more. In particular he has met the contentions of the 'new morality' with a case which is set on impregnable ground. He is not content with mere negation. With regard to the use of contraceptives, for example, he puts quite fairly what can be said for their reasonable use. And in his last chapter he sets himself to suggest positive measures which will help to meet the case of those who are in need of counsel and practical help. This is one of the very best of this admirable series.

A little book dealing with 'The Church Conflict on the Continent' has been published under the title of *No Other Gospel* (S.C.M.; 2s. net). It contains a course of six sermons 'preached from the pulpit of St. Benet's Church, Cambridge.' Of the preachers, who are of different denominations, perhaps the best known is Dr. N. Micklem. The sermons deal with the protests of the Confessional and Roman Catholic Churches in Germany and the Lutheran Church in Norway against the Nazi tyranny. They are in general clear and illuminating historically, while at the same time they have the didactic aim of showing the true nature of the Church as founded on the Word of God from which it must ever refuse to be seduced.

Christian Counter-Attack (S.C.M.; 6s. net) is a little book, by a group of writers (Hugh Martin, Douglas Newton, H. M. Waddams and R. R. Williams), giving a plain narrative of the battle of 'Europe's Churches against Nazism.' It treats in detail of the religious situation in each of the countries which have come under Nazi control. The aim of the various writers has been to set down the bare facts and leave them to make their own impression on the reader's mind. But their conviction is manifest—and they have made out a strong case for it—that the Christian Church, both Protestant and Catholic, has been the most steady, courageous, and powerful opponent of National Socialism, and has thereby shown an unexpected vitality and heroism. To the man in the street who has no use for the Church this narrative may come as a revelation; to the faint-hearted Christian it should be a rebuke and a mighty stimulus.

Suggestive Variants.

By the Reverend A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., D.Th., London.

As a teacher of Homiletics for thirty years I always insisted on the guiding principle, that not only should the text usually be taken from the Bible, but that a thorough study of the text should always be accompanied by a similar attention to the context, using all the aids that modern scholarship can offer to truer understanding, so that the treatment and content of the sermon should as far as possible be derived from the same source. Study of the original languages—Greek or Hebrew—is of course the ideal; but for those, e.g. lay preachers, who could not follow that method I advised a constant reference to the marginal notes in the Revised Version and the use of other

translations, English or foreign. The purpose of this article is to offer some illustration of the value of such methods of study.

(1) Ps 29^2: 'Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.' A.V. marg. 'in his glorious sanctuary,' R.V. marg. 'in holy array,' Moffatt 'in festal attire.' Mistaken though the phrase 'the beauty of holiness' may be in importing a moral content foreign to the context, yet how suggestive is the variant! There is a righteousness that repels, there is a goodness which attracts (cf. Ro 5^7); but in holiness there is variety in unity, discords resolved in harmony, that gives the same aesthetic satisfaction as does a work of art. Do not the variants suggest also that in the worship of God the outward form of beauty should accompany the inward substance of man's relation to God in communion with Him? Whether it be the building or the attire of the ministrants in worship, there should be worthy fitness. Much can be said for wearing best clothes on Sunday and having as fine churches as means allow.

(2) Ps 84^3: 'Yea, the sparrow hath found her an house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars, O Lord of hosts.' This verse presents an incongruous picture. An altar in use would not offer rest and safety; and even if the word be used in the wider sense of the temple itself, is it at all likely that nests would there be left undisturbed? The late Dr. Cheyne suggested that words must have fallen out as the rhythm as well as sense required some insertion to the effect that the pilgrim felt as much at home in the temple, as might a bird in her nest with her young. Moffatt cuts the knot drastically. He joins *vv.* 3 to 2, and reverses the order in *v.* 3.

'now soul and body thrill with joy over the living God,
over thine own altars,
O Lord of hosts, my King and God;
the bird has found her home at last,
a nest to lay her young!'

Such boldness of conjecture is surely fully justified.

(3) Is 53^9: 'And they made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.'

The parallelism of Hebrew poetry justified Moffatt's rendering:

'They laid him in a felon's grave,
and buried him with criminals.'

How often were the rich oppressors of the poor! This is no prediction of the grave Joseph the rich man provided as the words might suggest. A similar neglect of this Hebrew parallelism has led Matthew to represent Jesus as riding upon *two asses* in his triumphal entry (21^7) in fulfilment of Zechariah's prediction: 'riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass' (9^9). He, too, finds a proof of the virgin birth in Is 7^{14} (1^{23}). The R.V. also renders *virgin*, but adds in margin *maiden* (so Moffatt). There can be no doubt that the more general meaning is right. Each of the instances of fulfilment of prophecy must be carefully examined in its context, as the methods of the New Testament writers were not as ours.

(4) Two instances may here be given of very happy renderings by Moffatt presenting a concrete picture instead of an abstract term. In 1 Co 1^{13}, for 'Is Christ divided?' he gives: 'Has Christ been parcelled out?' He hits 'the nail on the head' of an apology offered for denominationalism that Christ is too great in His truth and grace to be *comprehended* as a whole in one Church; He needs to be *distributed* in parts among the Churches! In Gal 3^1, for 'Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified,' he gives 'Jesus Christ the crucified *placarded*.' Does not the word better convey the manner of the Apostle in this Epistle? Moffatt is often criticized by those who prefer 'the old wine to the new,' the A.V. to all other versions; but I have always found consultation of him rewarding.

(5) On the *placarding* of the Christ not *parcelled out* depends the Christian's distinctiveness in the world. How interesting in this connexion are the following variant renderings in Ph 3^{20}, A.V. 'Our conversation is in heaven.' R.V. 'Our citizenship (marg. commonwealth) is in heaven.' Moffatt: 'We are a colony of heaven.'

The Greek word is *politeuma* from *polis*, city, and it may mean: 1. An act of administration; 2. A form of government; 3. *Politeia*: (*a*) citizenship, (*b*) community, commonwealth (*A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, by G. Abbott Smith). Moffatt's rendering seems an extension of meaning justified by the fact that the citizens of heaven have their abode on earth, even as Rome's citizens as colonists represented its rule to the bounds of its dominions. Christians possess a *heavenly status*, 'theirs is the Kingdom of heaven' (Mt 5^3); they are engaged in a *heavenly mission*. 'Ye are the light of the world' (5^{14}); they must preserve their *heavenly character*, 'ye are the salt of the earth' which must not lose its savour (5^{13}). The status (citizenship) qualifies for the mission (colony), and the mission is fulfilled by the character (conversation).

(6) The Christian's character is developed not out of human endowments only or mainly, but first of all and most of all from divine resources. The eternal reality of the love of God, historically revealed in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, is personally experienced in the *communion* of the Holy Spirit (2 Co 13^{14}). The word *Koinonia*

here rendered *communion* is in Ph 2[1] rendered *fellowship*: it does not refer to an *individual* relation to God, but a *social*. Among men the mutual relation of those to whom the love of God has come in the grace of the Lord Jesus arises from their *common possession* of the Son (1 Co 1[9]), of the blood of Christ and of His body making them one body as partakers of one bread (10[16. 17]), of His sufferings (Ph 3[10]), of the Spirit (2 Co 13[14], Ph 2[1]). Although scholars will not allow us to render the word *community*, yet surely those who have so much in *common possession* as the bond of their communion or fellowship do form a community: and we may think of the Church as the community of the Holy Spirit, serving as the body of Christ and growing into the temple of God. A French version renders the word *communication*, reminding us that the Spirit is *given*, and a German *Antheilnahme*, participation that the gift is one to be *shared*.

(7) It is faith that receives the love of God and responds to that love in love, not to God only, but to man also, and love is 'the more excellent way' (1 Co 12[31]) than all the gifts of the Spirit in the body of Christ. Crucial for the primitive community as was the question of circumcision, and passionately as Paul contended against the Judaisers, who wanted to impose this yoke of bondage on Gentile believers, yet when he soars into the heavenly realm of his relation to Christ, the controversy in the earthly plane falls into insignificance. 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith *working* through love' (Gal 5[6]). The R.V. has in the margin or *wrought*. The Greek participle *energoumene* can be rendered in either way, and the two renderings are complementary. Faith is *energized* by the love (agape) of Christ for us (cf. 2 Co 5[14] 'the love of Christ *constraineth* us'), and faith *energizes* in our love (agape) for Him, and the brethren (*philadelphia*) and all men (*philanthropia*). Attention may also be called to the distinction of two Greek words used in the New Testament, *dynamis*, power, might, strength, ability (1 Co 15[42]: 'It is sown in weakness; it is raised in *power*') and *energeia*, 'operative power as distinct from *dynamis*, potential power.' The love of Christ not only possesses power, but exercises and perfects its power in imparting to man's weakness through faith potential power (2 Co 12[9]), which is then exercised in love. If dynamis is not translated into energeia, faith without works is dead.

(8) This exercise of love is the best way of '*serving* the Lord' (Ro 12[11]). The R.V. has the note, 'Some ancient authorities read the *opportunity*.' The Greek for Lord is *Kypio*, for opportunity *Kairo*: a scribe might easily make the mistake either way. While the word in the margin may have less manuscript authority, yet if we look at the series of which this is one, much can be said for it, as a specific is more probable than a general exhortation. The alternative readings are complementary. The Lord, 'the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever', dwells in eternity, we in time in the fleeting to-day, and yet how can we serve the Lord who abides better than by serving the opportunity, making the best and the most of each day as it passes? For the eternal God has an interest in time as the Creator, Preserver and Ruler of the world, and surely He has most at stake, if the phrase may be pardoned, as Redeemer of the world from sin, and Reconciler unto Himself in the Word, who in the Incarnation became *flesh* in time, and dwelt among men under the conditions of time, until after Crucifixion in His Resurrection He as Lord ascended to the eternal reality of God. It is not Christian faith, hope, or love which despises time, and does not serve God in its opportunity, for the Kingdom of God is present on earth, and although its full perfection must be in heaven, yet it is ever coming on earth, and it comes as men do the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven.

Many more illustrations will reward the diligent student of the Bible. May these suffice to show how much of the treatment and content of a sermon can be, not arbitrarily, but legitimately derived from the Bible itself with these varied aids of scholarship. Preaching would be more interesting, inspiring, influential, more a means of grace, if the Scriptures were more diligently searched to yield their hidden treasures in variant readings, renderings, meanings, and suggestions, under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth who leadeth unto all truth.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Quest of Truth.

By the Reverend Rolf Gledhill, M.A., B.D., S. Germain's Vicarage, Edgbaston, Birmingham.

'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'—Jn 8^{32}.

While Mary and Joseph watched over the infant Jesus in the stable at Bethlehem the shepherds came to see the Babe. Perhaps some of the people staying at the Inn went with them. None of these visitors was expected, but Mary and Joseph must have been happy to meet these new friends. But one day there was a still greater surprise. Wise men had come a long and distant journey to see the infant Jesus. These were no ordinary guests. They were the famous Magi, proud leaders of a great faith, men who had trained kings. They had made their journey from far-distant Persia, and had brought rich and precious gifts. As they presented these gifts to the infant Jesus they knew that their long quest was over.

To understand the quest of the Magi we must know something about the land from which they came. In Persia all boys, from the ages of five to twenty, were taught three things only—to ride, to draw the bow, and to speak the truth. For them the most disgraceful thing in the world was to tell a lie. The next worse was to owe a debt—because this compelled debtors to tell lies.

This love of truth was bound up with their religion. One of their great religious teachers, Zoroaster, had taught the people of Persia that their chief enemy was an evil spirit called 'The Lie.' A great battle was always going on between the Truth and the Lie, and Zoroaster rallied the people to follow him in fighting for the right and the true.

The Magi taught this way of life. They were the keepers of the sacred things. They trained the princes and the people of Persia to love the truth. For hundreds of years the Magi had given this message. They taught about this great struggle between Truth and the Lie, and that man must choose the Truth otherwise evil will befall him. At times the struggle was very difficult, and it seemed as though the Lie was more powerful. They were looking for more help and guidance. One night the Magi saw in the sky a new star. It meant that a new leader had come. Perhaps he could guide them. All their wealth, all their energy, all their time, they would gladly give if they could only find what they needed. So their journey began. And when at long last they knelt before the infant Christ they knew their quest was over. They had found the Christ who is the Way, and the Truth.

We all have to make this great discovery. We all know that the Truth is good, and the Lie is wrong—and yet we sometimes choose the Lie. Why did I do it? St. Paul was puzzled because he sometimes chose to do what he knew was wrong. He wrote in one letter: 'I cannot understand my own actions; I do not act as I want to act; on the contrary I do what I detest.' Then he makes the same discovery the Wise Men made. Victory comes through Christ. By following the way of Jesus St. Paul learned how to overcome his failures and mistakes.

Jesus has lived our earthly life, and He knows all about this great conflict between the Truth and the Lie. He knows how those who lose this battle become the victims of their own lies, and are sad and broken. But He promised new joy and strength to those who are loyal to Him. Those who, like the Wise Men, seek to know Jesus shall find in Him the power to be victorious. 'If my words abide in you,' said Jesus, 'then shall ye be truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'

Behind the Bars.

By Reverend George G. Barnes, B.A., Southport.

'Those who are eager to be rich get . . . trapped.'—1 Ti 6^{9} (Moffatt).

Have you ever been to the Zoo? If so, I know you went to see the monkey house. There are the great big chimpanzees which sit and blink lazily at you, as though they could tell you such a lot, if they cared. And there are the scampering, long-tailed Rhesus monkeys who never get tired of chasing each others' tails.

When you stand and watch these little fellows do you ever wonder how they allowed men to catch them?

If you had seen those monkeys in their wild homes in the tree tops in Africa or India you might well wonder how they were ever so silly as to be catchable at all. Yet it is quite simple to catch a monkey if you know how.

Here is the way my father used to catch them in his South African home when he was a boy. You first go into the garden, and cut a large pumpkin, something like a melon. Next you take a knife and cut a small hole in one side of the pumpkin. You must make the hole large enough for a monkey to push his hand through, but no larger than that.

Then you put the pumpkin on the garden path that evening, and go to bed. The monkey does the rest!

When all is quiet, and people have gone to bed, down comes the monkey—hop, skip, and jump—from the big trees near by. He loves pumpkin seeds, and your pumpkins are ripe for him! His sharp black eyes flash round to see if your are hiding behind the bushes. Then he comes across

your pumpkin lying on the path. 'What!' he thinks. 'Why what luck! Here is a pumpkin with a hole in its skin. No need for me to bite and tear at the hard rind, to reach the seeds.' Master Monkey gives another quick glance round, then pushes his hand into the hole, feels the ripe bunches of seeds inside, clutches a handful and pulls his clenched fist out of the hole. . . . 'Hello! The hand won't come out! Something has stuck.'

So the monkey tugs and tugs and tugs. But he cannot get his hand out while it holds the seeds.

He tugs and tugs, every minute growing more tired and more frightened. 'Foolish monkey,' you say. 'Let go your booty, open your hand. You cannot get free if you keep your seeds. You cannot eat your seeds till you can pull your fist out, but you cannot pull your fist out till you open your hand and lose the seeds! Poor Monkey!'

And so the monkey won't let go, and next morning you find him still there, with his hand inside the pumpkin.

Now he is in the cage behind the bars, just because he hadn't the sense to let go, and keep his freedom.

The monkey sits on his tail, and blinks his eyes at you. I sometimes think he is saying to me as I watch him, 'Poor human, with your crinkled furrows on your forehead. You too are trapped because you are greedy. You are always trying to grab and get things for yourself and frightened you are going to lose your possessions, and someone else will get them. Poor tired, frowning human, you are trapped too—like me.'

That is what St. Paul meant when he said, 'They that are eager to get rich get trapped.' 'Tell them' he says to his young secretary Timothy, 'tell them to be *open-handed*, generous, amassing right good treasure . . . in order to secure the life which is life indeed.'

The Christian Year.

First Sunday after Epiphany.

The Christian Life.

By the Reverend H. Cunliffe-Jones, B.D., B.Litt., Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford.

Romans 5^{1-5} (R.V.).

Verse 1. 'Being therefore justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.' We may take this passage as a summary of St. Paul's understanding of the Christian life: let us examine it to see whether God can give us through it new light in the twentieth century. St. Paul has been expounding his great doctrine of justification by faith. If we take God seriously as the Lord of the Universe who rules in righteousness, from whose power no evil-doer can escape, on whom all creatures depend utterly—and this is what the word 'God' means—then we know we cannot restore right relations with Him. St. Paul has tried his hardest and failed. God in His mercy has sent His only Son Jesus Christ as a means of reconciling men to Himself. God accepts men not because of their good works, but because they have faith in Jesus Christ, in His saving activity on behalf of all men. To accept the Lordship of Christ means release from strain and despair. St. Paul has known this in his own experience, and he holds forth our Saviour to us with all the gratitude of one who really knows that man cannot save himself. If there is a way into the Holy of Holies we cannot tread it by ourselves, we can only tread it in His steps, who loved us and gave Himself for us. What then does it mean to have this faith which rests on the work of Jesus Christ for us so that God counts us worthy to stand in His sight? It means first of all 'peace with God.'

What this meant to St. Paul and the early Christians is clearly evident from the New Testament writings. It meant the whole transformation of their lives. They knew the living God not as a stranger or as bringing judgment upon them but as opening to them the secret of His heart. All the shame and anxiety and frustration and hopelessness is done away. They had a living Lord in whose service they knew a freedom from their own selfish desires they had never known before. Does this sound strange? Is the peace of God something we never have hungered and thirsted after, something we are never likely to want with the urge of our whole being? If so, it is a mark of our shame and our decadence. The outer conflict of man is an expression of an inner contradiction—man is astray from the central meaning of life, he seeks to dominate others in terms of his own sinful desires instead of living by trust in obedience to God, accepting others as fellow-children of God. It is no criticism of the Bible but of ourselves that people do not think of 'peace with God' as the thing that is missing from their lives and from the society that man has made. It is a sign that we are become so inhuman that we have almost lost the sense of the majesty of God. The farther we are away from a true sense of sin the less are we aware of the nature of the conflict in our lives, and we have only a dull ache which does not speak directly of God. Also the local Christian Church has not shown itself clearly enough to be a company of those in whom this transforming revolution has taken place. The world in ignorance is hungry for the peace of God, and it must be exhibited not in word but in power.

Verse 2. 'Through whom also we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand; and let us rejoice in hope of the glory of God.' St. Paul has mentioned Jesus Christ, and goes off at a tangent, as his manner is, to explain that this great experience is due not to our own efforts but to the Saviour on whom we all depend. There are still those who think that St. Paul invented Christianity. St. Paul himself never tired of giving all the credit for anything he did to Jesus Christ, and the mere mention of that name made him express adoring gratitude. The first sign of this new state of peace is that 'we rejoice in hope of the glory of God.' I wonder if we would put that first if we were asked to tell someone

what the Christian life means to us? And yet it is the really important thing. Human nature taken by itself is a sinful and weak thing; with much goodness, yet not able to make its goodness last; with many fine actions, but betrayed by its self-centredness. True glory belongs to God alone, and any glory in human nature must be borrowed from Him. Because God has called man into eternal fellowship with Himself there is a meaning in man's life which man cannot put there. And this belief in the glory of God, while it looks beyond this world, does not turn away from life: rather it is the light of the glory of God in Jesus Christ which has shone right into the midst of this life to give strength to our actual selves as we journey towards our fulfilment in God.

Verses 3, 4. 'And not only so, but let us also rejoice in our tribulations: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, probation; and probation, hope.' Many people may find this emphasis of St. Paul's on the glory of God irritating because it is so far removed from the actual conditions they have to meet. But the Apostle goes on to assert that the rejoicing of the Christian life is shown also in the midst of troubles. St. Paul, of course, did not know the horrors of a war-torn world in the twentieth century, but we know (2 Co 11^{25-27}) that he suffered all conceivable hardships in his witness to his Lord. He has a right to speak to us of rejoicing over trouble. What he says is that the bearing of trouble gives us a new patience under strain, and we find in it a testing of our character which gives us a new hope. The trouble is still dreadful and unpleasant, but in meeting it our character has become stronger and we have a new hope that we can overcome in the future whatever trials meet us. Many people under the strain of bombardment have gained a new confidence in themselves because they have stood firm in great difficulty.

Verse 5. 'And hope putteth not to shame; because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us.' But this rejoicing in trouble is not automatic. We all know people on whom dire affliction has fallen and it has withered such flowers of affection and goodness as they have had, and made them hard and bitter. No: such rejoicing is due to Christian faith because the Holy Spirit works in our hearts to manifest that love which alone can make us rejoice in the day of trouble. So we come back again to Jesus Christ where we began. See how naturally the Christian faith in God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit comes to expression on the Apostle's lips. Through faith in Jesus Christ we know the God of righteousness as the Father of our spirits, and through Him too we know God the Holy Spirit working in our hearts the strength of the divine love. In one of the Greek legends the hero meets a wrestler who when thrown back on to the earth, rose stronger than ever because the earth was his mother. We Christians derive our strength from Christ: only in keeping close to Him can we maintain it. If in the troubles of life we have only ourselves to fall back on we shall be beaten: if we are driven back on Christ we shall be stronger than ever, and have that rejoicing which is the fruit of peace with God.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPHIPHANY.

Moses—God's Plan in a Man's Life.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID CAIRNS, M.A., CHAPLAIN TO THE FORCES.

Exodus 3^{1-17}.

The sun was setting over the rugged mountain when a man came to the spring that broke out clear from between two rocks under a shaggy broom-bush. The whole rocky valley was coloured crimson in his last rays. The heat of the day was over, and there was no sound but the splashing of the water in the little pool. The man was dressed as an Arab shepherd, but the hands with which he bathed his face as he knelt at the water-side were not the rough hands of a shepherd.

He pulled out his food—what remained of the 'haversack ration' which in the haste of his flight he had snatched up as he left his home—and as he ate and drank his mind passed over the events of the last two days. He was a fugitive, and now for the first time he was able to relax. All around him were the mountain silences, the peaks, passes, and valleys. It was lucky for him that in earlier, happier days he had come with the Egyptian princes on hunting expeditions into this wild and desolate country, and so knew something of it. He had stood himself high in the favour of the Egyptian royal family. He had had every advantage that culture and education could give or money buy. And this in spite of the fact that he belonged to the despised Hebrew people—for he was the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter. It was indeed that strange double existence as Hebrew and Egyptian that had brought him to this pass. For he had killed an Egyptian who was bullying a Hebrew—and the story leaked out. If he had remained in Egypt his life would not have been worth a day's purchase—a trial and condemnation on the charge of murder would have been a certainty.

So Moses fled. A week ago and life seemed to be opening before him. There was hardly any expectation that seemed too high for his future. To-day life was finished. Nothing remained for him but the existence of an outlaw—at the best he would be a shepherd eking out a wretched existence among the desert tribes that fought for the best pastures and wells for their flocks. I don't suppose that a man often saw the sun fading on the mountain tops with a much drearier heart. Twilight fell around him, a cold wind stirred the branches of the broom-bush over the well, and plucked at his robes. He covered himself up as best he might and lay down to sleep as the stars came out.

A number of years passed by, and the same man came striding down a road in the heat of the day among these same glaring stony mountains. Time had drawn lines of character upon his face. And his lips were moving as he walked deep in thought.

He was talking to himself, or as I believe, to his God. 'Lord, when to-day I stood in your presence beside the burning bush you called me to go down into Egypt to deliver my people from Pharaoh. But you know how I am a fugitive from justice in that very land. I killed an Egyptian, and shall be put to death if I show myself there.'

'My people are suffering in Egypt, Moses, and praying to Me for deliverance. I have called you, and will keep you safe until your task is finished.'

'But I am not eloquent, Lord, and I cannot face Pharaoh.'

'If not you, who can? Was it for nothing that I placed you in Pharaoh's court, that I taught you the Egyptian language, that I taught you to speak Pharaoh's language? If you have not now the confidence to deal with Pharaoh and his like, is that My fault, or yours? But if you still feel unequal to the task, I'll send your brother Aaron with you to speak for you.'

'But I cannot lead my people through the desert.'

'If you cannot, then who can? Was it for nothing that I led you into the wilderness, where you came to know the rough shepherds and their ways? Did not you marry among them so that you are now a trusted friend and leader among them? Did you not wander through the desert, learning all its springs and its passes, so that now it is known to you like the palm of your hand? Was it for nothing that I gave you these ten years in the wild places? You thought that life had come to an end, but a new, a second, life had been planned for you by Me. And now that too is over, and I ask you to go forward to a third life for which I have been preparing you all the time. Be strong and of a good courage, for I who have taken so much trouble with you to guard and prepare you will not now desert you. I will be with you to guide and protect you wheresoever you go. You are the only man in the world who has been prepared to do this task for Me.'

And Moses lifted up his eyes and saw that before him there was a spring where the waters flowed out from between two rocks, while a gnarled broom-bush stood above it. For a moment he paused, knowing it, and yet not knowing it; and then he clearly remembered that day when in despair he sat down there, and lay down to sleep under the stars without hope. He drank of the well, laying down his staff, then, picking it up again, he turned and walked down the pass, well content, to Egypt and the great task which God had assigned to him in the world's history.

And now perhaps you ask yourself, 'Why is he telling us this old story, what good can it do us so many thousands of years after Moses?'

I'll try to answer that question. As I see the situation in which the most of you stand, it is this. When the war began, you were perhaps already settled down in your job, and you may have already a wife and family. Or else you were just about the school-leaving age, and had planned more or less definitely what you were going to do with your life. And then the war came and cut across all these plans. The years since seem to you wasted years. It would not have been so bad, you think, if you had had the chance to go abroad and get into action. But year after year went by, and you were neither getting on with your peace-time job or with the fighting in the war. Was your experience not rather like the case of the man we were speaking about whose own prospects were cut off, and before whom a dreary future seemed to stretch indefinitely? What God is saying to you through this story of Moses is: 'Don't be discouraged.' Soon, perhaps very soon, this stage will come to an end. The time in between will not have been wasted for those men who have put their backs into it. I am not talking just about military training, though that is part of it. When a man gets older he sees how there has been a plan of God running through his life, and how this experience and that have fitted in to teach him what was necessary, and to prepare him for the really big job that God has for him.

Of course if one merely grouses and is idle, then one misses the plan. But take it from me, the God who guided and trained Moses is still God, and He has taken a great deal of trouble with each one of us. And He who has been guiding you, even when you did not know it, will be able to use you. What you learnt then at each stage of your life will come in useful some day, for God is using your life for two things, if you will let Him. First He is making a man out of you—a living soul that will be worthy to live for ever, and do great things for Him in time and in eternity. And He is fitting you also for a job in this world that no other person can fill in His great plan for humanity.

So you are not, and I am not, just a life living rather forlornly in the midst of a world without a purpose or plan. You have your part to play in God's big plan, and if you try to find it and do it, you are sure of His friendship and guidance and companionship for ever.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Our Assumptions.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'Nevertheless . . .'—Mt 26^{64}.

Yes; but, of course——! I wonder how many times in the day that little phrase falls from our lips! We would do well to watch ourselves whenever we slip in that qualification, because it is the thing we take as a matter of course that gives to our life its drive and its direction. What we see may say this or that, and what we say may mean that or this. Yes; but, of course——! It is our real signature that we fill in at that dotted line. It is what we live by. It is our faith.

Field Marshall, now Lord, Wavell will have many titles to fame, but I shall always remember him as the general who said, 'Of course.' That was in 1940, when things were looking very black for us and for our cause. In those dark days when, to all appearances, we had little chance to survive, he told his troops in the Middle East quite frankly

what had happened and he ended quietly like this: 'The British Empire, of course, will continue the struggle.' I am glad that Lord Wavell holds the high office that he does, because, for a man in his position, his assumptions are right.

On the other hand, I heard a distinguished officer speaking on the wireless the other night. He was referring to that same dreadful year of 1940 and he said this: 'I thought, at that time, that the war would be over by Christmas.' Meaning that, 'of course,' the Germans would win. That officer held a very high post, but I am glad that it was no higher than it was, because, for a man in his position, his assumptions were wrong.

So let us look to our assumptions, because what we quietly assume is at once the steering gear and the driving power of our life.

1. It sometimes happens that what we assume does not quite tally with what we see, or say, or have to do.

Suppose I asked you to tell me what you thought of So-and-So. 'Oh,' you say, 'he's a very able man. And hasn't he got charming manners? But, of course——!' Of course—what? Well, rightly or wrongly, that is your real opinion of the unfortunate Mr. So-and-So, so that, whatever you see in him or say about him or do in the matter at all, that is where you start from and come back to—'but, of course——!'

I once asked a lad of ability and industry how he was getting on with his reading for a certain examination. 'Not so badly,' he said, 'but, of course——!' And when the pass list was published his name wasn't there. His assumptions had been wrong. What you see or say or do may be this, that, or the other. What tells in the long run is what you quietly assume. For that's your faith—or your unfaith. That's what you live by—or will die of.

2. Sometimes a new assumption may come upon us suddenly and take us by surprise.

It is proverbially not safe to assume that the weather which prevails to-day will prevail to-morrow. But there is a climate of the mind and of the soul, and it is not safe to make assumptions about that, either. And yet, many people do. 'Now I, to comfort him,' said Mistress Quickly of Falstaff, 'bid him a' should not think of God, I hoped there was no need to trouble himself with any such thoughts yet.' Yes; but, of course——! One never knows when that moment may come when the old assumptions will be shattered by the breaking in of a new one, as it came to old Falstaff when he began to fumble with the sheets and shout for God.

Our Lord tells of such a case. 'Soul,' said the man to himself, 'thou hast many goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry.' Then, one day, he sat up suddenly for a thought had occurred to him: 'Yes; but of course—— all this may come to an end.' And so it did. 'This night,' said God, 'thy soul shall be required of thee.'

God? Immortality? Life after death? Who knows anything about such matters? Who can prove anything one way or the other? The one certain thing is this life and this world; as for any other——. Yes; but, of course——! Of course—what? Just this:

> Just when we are safest, there's a sunset-touch,
> A fancy from a flower-bell, some one's death—

And so, a man may go on living for many years on the assumption that there is no God, no judgment, no hereafter. But there's no knowing when, or at what door, the new assumption (new, because so old) may not rap and knock and enter with its sudden 'Yes; but, of course——' the grand Perhaps.

3. The great assumptions may be there all the time, like the calm underneath a troubled sea.

There was the man to whom life had sent its share of doubts and difficulties and sorrows, and all these things seemed to say that there was no answer, no future, no hope. 'But, of course——,' he said. Of course—what? Just this:

> Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
> Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
> Sleep to wake.

So let every man put himself to the test. My sins? My death? The magnitude and malignity of the evil in the world? Yes, but, of course——! How do I fill in the blank space?

4. How did Jesus? What were His assumptions? For one in His position, and with His claims and credentials, it matters supremely. Let us watch Him as He fills in at the dotted line.

Our sins? Jesus assumed that, without the help of God, all men are guilty, helpless, and lost. Yes; but, of course——! Of course, what? 'But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, he saith—Arise.' Jesus assumed that the lost can be found and the sinner saved.

Our death? Jesus assumes that the grave awaits us all. 'Lazarus is dead,' He said. And then He quietly adds: 'Nevertheless, let us go unto him—he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.' Jesus assumed that the real world is the spiritual world, and that there is an eternity that awaits us all. 'If it were not so, I would have told you.'

The magnitude and malignity of the evil there is in the world? All His disciples had forsaken Him and fled. His cause on earth was apparently overthrown. He Himself was under sentence of death. 'Yes,' said He to Caiaphas, 'but, of course——!' But let Him fill in the blank: 'Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.'

The Son of man sitting—the victory won! The Son of man coming—the victory shared! The assumptions justified!

'Yes; but, of course——!' If to-day you are still in doubt, or if to-morrow you may be in despair, take the dotted line to Him and let Him help you to fill it in. Because He knows.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

I will Fear no Evil.

BY THE REVEREND FRANK THOMPSON, B.A.,
ULVASTON, LANCASHIRE.

'Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.'—Ps 23[4].

'I will fear no evil.' The man who has learnt to say that has found one of the secrets of true valour. Yet is it not strange that there should be some who have such a mistaken idea of the Christian faith that they charge it with being at the root of the fears that harass the minds of men—in spite of the fact that there stands at the heart of the Christian's Bible, and in one of its best known passages, a declaration such as this?

The Psalmist has been comparing Jehovah to a watchful shepherd. Tended by such a shepherd he feels that he can begin by singing of sufficiency and renewal and safety. Yes, but the Psalmist knew, and we know, that there never was a sheep that was satisfied for long with green pastures and still waters, no matter how ample they are. A sheep may go nibbling on, blindly following its nose, or be scared into a stampede by some strange sight or sound, or may simply yield to the urge which sends it through the first hole in the fence, but sooner or later it gets into dark and unfamiliar and perilous places. Its only hope then lies in the shepherd with rod and staff being on its track. And as with the sheep, so with the soul of man. Therefore the Psalmist continues, 'Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me: thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.'

What a verse is this for every uncertain soul! For when it speaks of the valley of the shadow of death it isn't primarily the fact of physical death that is meant, though that may come into it. But the phrase has a much wider significance than that. John Bunyan was right in taking his pilgrim through the Valley of the Shadow of Death long before he crossed the River of Life into the Celestial City. Just as a straying sheep finds that it is not green pastures and still waters all the way, so also does straying man. A man's sin and the sin of his neighbour, his repeated failures to be his best, his discovery that although he means to do so much he achieves but little—all these and much besides will often cast their shadow over him. Hardship and loss, trial and tragedy, especially in a day such as this, may darken his life. At such times he is passing through the valley of the shadow of death, the valley of deep gloom; and, to say the least of it, he finds it a not very comfortable place. It is the kind of experience through which a man may pass many times in life, sometimes more than once in a single day. The Psalmist takes it all into account, and he declares that there is no need to fear.

It is striking to pass on and find how Jesus said precisely the same kind of thing, albeit in a different way. He saw—none ever saw more clearly—the clouds which darken human life; He saw the havoc that men's sin could and would work in the world, and the misery and anxiety that were bound to accompany and follow it. And He is careful to assure us that whether we build our house on the sand or on the rock, we can be certain that the rain will fall and the floods will come and the winds will blow and beat upon it. No—Jesus never gave anybody a fair-weather guarantee—not even the man who built on the rock. But He did say that that man's house would stand! So—no matter how fierce the elements, that man has nothing to fear. To all such the Saviour says, 'Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.'

Some twenty years after the death of our Lord, there was another who discovered the truth of all this. It was St. Paul. In the familiar eighth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans he goes through a list of experiences which commonly darken human life and imperil the souls of men; and he crosses them off, one by one, as being powerless to separate the believer from the Saviour's love. Each item in the list is surprisingly modern; it includes anguish and calamity, persecution and famine, starvation and peril and strife; and the Apostle throws in the whole bewildering collection of things present and things to come, and then gives it as his considered verdict that the Christian man can meet them all together and be more than a match for the lot! In the same chapter we read, 'You have received no slavish spirit that would make you relapse into fear; you have received the spirit of sonship.'

'But,' someone may interject, 'that is all very well—yet telling those that are of a fearful heart to be strong and fear not, isn't it rather like telling a drowning man to swim?' There is more in it than that; but even so, would there be any harm in telling a supposedly drowning man to swim if you were quite sure that he could? For is it not simply surprising what people will and will not do under the stress of panic and fear?

When the Bible bids those that are fearful 'Be strong' there is much more to it than that. 'Even though I have to walk through the valley of deep gloom, I will fear no evil; and this is why,' says the Psalmist; 'my shepherd is with me.' A morbid and fearful timidity is alien and hostile to true life; and the gospel, which teaches that he that feareth is not made perfect in love, has revealed a fearless love which can, and will, and does cast out fear. 'My Shepherd,' cries the Psalmist, with heartening confidence ringing in every word, 'is actually at my side, with me in the darkness and the horror and the gloom and facing it for my sake; and His power, His patience, His inexhaustible love are more than adequate to ensure my safety and rescue; and knowing that gives me heart and nerve!' Do not the Psalmist's words strike a responsive echo in your heart?

Let us pursue our subject a little way longer, thinking what God can do through fearlessly courageous lives. Gideon, for example, found that it was better to divide the number of his men by

three than to have a larger company with two out of every three trembling and terrified. Such an illustration could be multiplied many times—one more must suffice. When Thomas Carlyle had finished writing the first volume of his account of the French Revolution, he lent the precious manuscript to John Mill, one of his closest friends. While in Mill's charge the document was accidentally destroyed—all but a few fragments of leaves. Five months of hard and painful toil was lost. Carlyle had forgotten practically every word he had written in that first volume; he was already at work on the second, and his financial resources were being severely strained. Nobly did he endeavour to hide his grief and his plight from his friend and, uttering a cry to God for faith, he wrote in his log: 'It is as if my invisible schoolmaster had torn my copybook when I showed it and said: "No, boy! Thou must write it better." What can I do but obey? . . . On in His Name!'

Is it not astounding what God can do through such fearlessly courageous souls? It is even more astounding that He can create such souls out of the common clay of humanity! Even Moses and Jeremiah began their careers as exceedingly timid mortals—so too did every one of the disciples. But the mighty Spirit of God changed all that! And that same Spirit is working that same amazing miracle over again in our hearts to-day. Your courage may not attract the attention of the Press; it may not be recorded in the pages of history; but it is going to make a vast difference to the tone and temper of your life; others will feel it in the atmosphere—without being able to say exactly what it is; they will envy your secret and want to share your confidence—it will all be so real both when the sky is blue and when clouds are dark and threatening. And if at any time the storms should break and buffet you, may you also say, 'I will fear no evil, for thou art with me.' For answer, One will speak as He spoke to His first disciples on storm-tossed Galilee, 'Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.'

SEPTUAGESIMA.

Endurance.

'Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them.'—Mk 11^{24}.

'It reads like throwing dust in our eyes—the kind of thing one would tell to credulous children, not to thinking men. If you want anything, pretend you have got it and you shall have it.' Thus far, the natural man.

Let us try to meet his criticism half-way. Take this matter of 'pretending.' Of course there is a pretence that is stark hypocrisy. Thousands of people go through life content with themselves if they can keep up appearances. That is 'the lie in the soul'—the most devastating of all lies. But is there not a 'pretending' that is a very noble and enviable quality of spirit? At the end of the day, when 'they that are first shall be last and the last first,' many a thrilling tale will be told of countless obscure people who went on for a life-time 'pretending' that their desperate handicaps of poverty, loneliness, or ill-health simply did not exist—they were preoccupied with something bigger—and who, by magnificently ignoring them, won through to splendid spiritual achievement.

These things being said, let us return to the text and explore its rich suggestiveness. The vital phrase is 'when ye pray.' It makes us pause, at the outset, to inquire *what a Christian may lawfully ask when he approaches God who is a Spirit.* It asserts that, when we present these worthy and desirable petitions in utter faith, they will be abundantly answered. Consider the requests natural to a Christian in ordinary life and in a world gone mad—a world of lies, hatreds, cruelties, and tragic sorrows, with all the problems these things set to the faith of every honest man.

The first would be the prayer for *power*—the request that God would make us adequate to life as we know it.

Even for the wisest and strongest of us, life is an affair desperately hard to manage and control. A quaint essayist lately compared his efforts to master life to the task of trying to press a half-deflated balloon into a receptacle many sizes too small for it! Just when he was about to close down the lid, another portion impudently emerged and refused to be captured! We find ourselves committed to a warfare as baffling as it is unending. Truly our crying need is for spiritual skill and adequacy.

This, of course, is not new. It has been described in language which, on the face of it, seems remote and mysterious but, in its essential meaning, is as clear as the sun at noon. 'We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.' It were good for our souls if we could regale ourselves with the big, challenging and liberating thought to which these words are the introduction. To be adequate to a life so full of snares and ambushes for the unwary, the Apostle tells us we must put on the whole armour of God—but for what purpose? For one only, that we may serve our fellowmen with every power of our being.

The chief reason why we are so often subjected to deadly temptation is that we only call in the help of God so that we may fulfil our own self-centred careers. We want back our health, our reputation, our peace of mind, for our own ends and not for the glory of God and His service. No man can lawfully pray for release from temptation unless it is for liberty to do the will of God. A cowardly fear of exposure is no part of a sincere Christian prayer. All this is as subtle as it is real. There is such a thing as finding ourselves 'even in penance, planning sins anew.' There is but one security against this deadly danger. It is to cease hugging the shore and to launch out into the deep, into the broad channels of Christian service. In such a nobly committed and wholly preoccupied life, evil can find no crevice for its entrance. Let service and not self be our aim. So, 'when ye

pray,' when you offer the only prayers a Christian has a right to offer, and ask the only requests that will equip you for a self-forgetting life of labour—when you pray, believe that for such a life God pledges Himself to empower you to the uttermost, and you will believe—to receive.

The second petition a sincere Christian may lawfully present to God is *the prayer for spirituality*. Spirituality may be defined as 'that something which abides when all else crashes.' If that is true, nay, because it is true, surely it is our supreme need for the days through which we are passing. Why should we deceive ourselves? Sooner or later, the acid test comes to each of us.

> All must sip the cup of sorrow,
> I to-day and thou to-morrow.

Huxley says in one of his letters: 'There is always a Cape Horn in one's life that one either weathers or wrecks oneself on.' How then can we be sure that we shall weather it? Is it not by having that within us which will enable us to perform our earthly duties with all the efficiency of the most capable man of the world, which will enable us to enjoy to the full every pleasure lawful to a Christian man, and yet have that within us also which neither life nor death can touch?

> Be like the bird
> That, pausing in her flight
> Awhile on boughs too slight,
> Feels them give way beneath her
> And yet sings,
> Knowing that she hath wings.

Of a famous man, Emerson once said: 'The more life took away from him, the greater he appeared.' Could there be any nobler testimony than that of spiritually-minded men and women when the tragedy of war comes home to them in the loss of a loved and gifted son? How it confirms our faith in what God can do for a man in his darkest hour to see such people rise from a blow like this, bruised but not destroyed in spirit.

> Nothing before, nothing behind,
> The steps of faith
> Fall on the seeming void—to find
> The rock beneath.

Surely it is experiences like these our Lord had in mind when He said: 'Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, believe that ye receive them and ye shall have them.' We shall be able to face life without being at the mercy of its changes and chances, to confront all that may happen to us with the spiritual equanimity of him who said: 'I know how to be abased and how to abound, to be full and to be empty, to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.'

Finally, though it may appear somewhat of an anticlimax, there is the urge within us for what one might call *the daily restoration*. Which of us but knows that numb, listless temper of mind which murmurs dejectedly—'Who will show us any good?' 'We have toiled all night and caught nothing.' 'The battle goes sore against us to the going down of the sun.' Perhaps the answer to this mood—this prayer for the heart to go on amid so much that disheartens—can come only with a renewed vision of Christ.

A poignant incident is recorded in the life of Charlotte Brontë. It was told by Richmond, the artist. She was sitting for her portrait in his studio and he was on the verge of despair. Her face was lined with suffering, the aftermath of her tragic home life. He found himself quite incapable of transferring to canvas a face so charged with sadness. As he talked to her, he happened to mention that had she been a little earlier she would have caught a glimpse of his last sitter as he departed. It was the Duke of Wellington. Every Brontë lover knows how the Duke had been worshipped from childhood by Charlotte and her sisters. Instantly her face lit up with a strange light. She began to talk eagerly of her hero. The painter caught her rapt expression and went on to complete the admirable portrait by which she is best known.

We too have kindled at a Name! We have but to name His name, to tell ourselves what manner of Being He is, gracious, forgiving, missing us more than we miss Him; we have but to see Him standing there in His sandals, to know that there is no peace for us but in a closer walk with Him. He knows this hunger. He comprehends this daily recurring need. He will abundantly answer it. When ye pray this most desirable, most natural, most worthy of all prayers, that you may be right with God and in loving intimacy with Christ, believe that ye have it and ye shall have it.[1]

[1] G. J. Jeffrey, *Christian Resources*, 43.

Has Man Made God in His Own Image?

By the Reverend Peter C. Young, M.A., B.Litt., Curate of Ottery St. Mary.

'The wish is father to the thought' is an old saying. Man has always had a tendency to think what he wants to think and to reject what he doesn't. His desires have always been stronger than his critical faculties, and so always capable of perverting his judgments rather than being themselves directed by them.

In recent times, however, the popularity of modern psychological knowledge, with its jargon of 'wishful-thinking,' 'projection,' etc., has pre-

disposed us to suspect the validity of any belief which happens at the same time to be pleasant, at least unless it is capable of scientific demonstration. Warnings against the danger of wishful-thinking are on every side.

In this atmosphere it is not surprising that religion, which is concerned wholly with spiritual truth necessarily incapable of scientific proof, and which is, at the same time, full of 'comfortable doctrine,' should be suspect.

It is hoped that what follows may be of some help in clarifying this difficulty, and suggesting a line whereby the haunting suspicion of subjectivism may be removed from the minds of some who hesitate to commit themselves to a faith which they fear may have no roots outside the wistful longings of lonely man.

I. *That the Christian God is not the Product of human Wishful-Thinking.* There seems to me to be two assurances of this, as follows :

(*a*) If man had created a god in his own image, for his own pleasure, would he be the *sort* of God whom we worship in Christ ? Could a God whose way is essentially that of a 'Suffering Servant' along a 'Via Dolorosa,' and who uncompromisingly demands that His disciples shall follow Him along the same path,[1] be the product of the wishful-thinking of man, whose most native instinct is that of self-assertion and self-protection ? Would *such* a creature[2] have wishfully created *such* a God to follow and serve, a God whose self-renunciation is that of the Cross, and who exacts a cross as the price of discipleship, in ancient arena and modern concentration camp ?

The wishful-thinking theory might account for the distorted picture which nineteenth-century liberalism produced of 'gentle Jesus meek and mild,' but not for the God of historic Christian Theology. In fact, Theology has always had to fight the tendency of man to reduce God to the measure of his own taste, and to encourage him to say 'I will serve Thee not for what I would have Thee be, but for what Thou eternally art.'

The God of the Gospels and the Cross has always struck the non-Christian as unpalatable and not at all to his taste. In New Testament days the Jews found Him a 'stumbling-block' (too humiliating), the Gentiles 'foolishness' (too unsophisticated) ; in the Middle Ages almost all men transferred their allegiance from Him to His more attractive earthly vicar ; modern secular man finds Him—let Dr. Joad speak—'most disconcerting . . . stern . . . angry . . . unjust.'[3] But Paul counted natural gain as dung that he might win Him.

Perhaps it may be said that the Nazi is equally prepared to renounce all, even life itself, in the service of his god, the Great State. Yes, but the Nazi State is the perfect embodiment of man's most native instinct of self-assertion, and it is in the satisfaction of *that* that he dies. There is all the difference in the world between Pastor Niemöller facing martyrdom, defenceless, and with nothing to gratify his natural inclinations, and the young fanatic, charging across the Russian snows, in the teeth of machine-guns, but all the time fulfilling his native human lust for aggression, self-display, and self-assertion. If you want to know what Nazi 'philosophy' thinks of the Christian idea of self-renunciation, read some of their doctrinaire publications to the Hitler Youth !

No, I do not think that the 'natural' man would have created so embarrassing a God, had he been making one to his own pattern ; 'gentle Jesus meek and mild' perhaps, for his comfort ; Adolf Hitler perhaps, for his self-assertion ; but hardly the God of the Cross, so abased and yet so exacting, so unpalatable on both scores !

(*b*) *And now for the second assurance.* This is a psychological point. Surely the 'God-a-Projection' theory rests on a misapprehension of that particular psychological mechanism. In projection, we push off our Ego-Ideal on to some already given, externally real object, which is made to embody it. It is always a projection on to something already there. Thus an angry disputant projects his anger on to his opponent and swears that he is angry ; thus a lover declares that his very plain Harriet is a Venus ! Even when we embroider the object of our projection with symbolic imagery, it is always memory-imagery drawn from a real experience. We never invent the object for ourselves out of nothing ; and indeed, if the object be illusory, it is eventually destroyed by the actual process of projection. It is not on this mechanism that the above theory can claim to rest. Professor L. W. Grensted, of Oriel College, Oxford, states the case in some way as follows, though here I do not quote his words exactly.

People will say that God is our Ego-Ideal projected. This is calling on a psychological principle which does not exist. No projection can be made which is not real. The process of projection automatically destroys any object whose reality is not more permanent than itself. If God had been the object of human projection, He would have been destroyed by the actual process.

[1] 'Whosoever doth not bear his cross . . . cannot be my disciple.'—Lk 14[27].

[2] A modern testimony to the fact of the essential evil in human nature can be found in C. E. M. Joad's new book, *God and Evil*, ch. 3. It is not necessary to turn to an orthodox exponent of the Doctrine of Original Sin !

[3] *Op. cit.*, 319.

Speaking of the objective reality of that which carries our projection, Dr. Grensted says (and here I quote his actual words) '. . . all psychological projection is a projection *upon* something. . . . It is always, in principle, like seeing father in the beard and robe of Santa Claus. . . . In other words, we never pass outside a true subject-object relation, and the process of projection is always a process within that relation. The "other" is always there.' [1]

II. *The Subjective Element.*[2] Nevertheless, there is an element about the Object we worship which *is* created by our own imaginations—not the One, the Divine Ego, the Self, God as He in Himself eternally is, but the physical features in which we embody Him in our mind's eye.

This is inevitable and necessary to our present mode of existence in which, being visualists, we can only perceive spiritual realities by means of a mental image composed of spatio-temporal, three-dimensional ingredients, formed, that is, from the only mode of existence of which we have sensible experience. And as, in this order of things, we experience personality most deeply in *human* embodiment, it is natural for us to conceive our image of the Divine Personality by anthropological analogy—always, of course, with the conscious acknowledgement that these terms are but analogical. Maybe we can say that God recognizes this limitation in human perception and accommodates Himself to it in the Incarnation, thus authorizing our conviction both that such a mode of perception is valid and that it is His will for us to use it.

As an analogy, take the case of a human friendship at a distance. By long correspondence, talks over the telephone, experience of his action on my behalf, etc., I may get to know a man really well, without any idea of what he looks like. But inevitably I shall clothe him in a physical image, in my mind's eye. That subjectively created image will, no doubt, be utterly different from the objectively existing one, yet this in no way vitiates the reality of my fellowship with my friend. I can still truthfully say 'I know him well.' Maybe that is a little like our knowledge of God, through the use of the subjective mental image, which we undoubtedly do 'project' upon Him.

III. *The Objective Reality of God Himself and the Validity of our Knowledge of Him.* But all this subjectivity applies only to the physical image as we conceive it. The Divine Personality Himself, God as He eternally is, the Ground of Existence, is objectively real and absolutely 'given.' Now, how do we know this? What *kind* of perception have we of Him? and what sort of certainty does it bring? These are the crucial questions. It is clearly not the same kind of perception as we have of scientific knowledge, and it does not bring that kind of certainty, nor yet of self-evident [3] truth. That is to say, I do not know God in the kind of way or with the kind of certainty with which I know a sensibly observable fact,[4] or a fact which I cannot grasp without automatically knowing to be true.[5]

Rather, I know Him by an immediate awareness, a spiritual intuitiveness, by a living and personal response which His Presence spontaneously awakens within me. As a matter of fact, this is a mode of perception by which we know much in life once we get outside the narrow scientific sphere of what can be precisely measured and weighed, by which we make judgments other than 'provable,' scientific-judgments, such as faith-judgments, value-judgments, æsthetic-judgments and personal-judgments. For example, I *know* that truth is better than falsehood, that love is better than hate, or that Bach's B Minor Mass is greater music than 'Olivet to Calvary.' In trouble, I know that the fellowship of my friend is something real, that there is more than an animated body at my side. I can 'prove' none of those things in the sense in which the scientist 'proves' his theory, I have not that kind of certainty of them, and yet I am certain of them with a certainty on which I would stake everything.

Such, in some measure, is our knowledge of God—not a provable theory, but a faith-judgment and a personal-judgment on which we would stake all.

Perhaps a better analogy, because more clearly involving a personal relationship, is that knowledge which one has of the presence of another human personality in the same room, even if he can be neither seen, felt, nor heard. There is nothing there perceptible to the senses, therefore one has no scientific knowledge of the presence, and yet one knows it with a certainty that can make a sensitive person scream!

An interesting thing about this is that the stronger the personality present, the stronger this knowledge becomes. A friend of mine, who has been many years in India, was telling me that, in the case of the tremendous personalities of some of the great Hindu mystics, you can positively feel them come in and out of the room! Once

[1] In a personal correspondence.

[2] For some of the ideas in this section I am indebted to Mr. C. S. Lewis of Magdalen College, Oxford, in a private correspondence.

[3] If God were self-evident, no man could doubt Him without being insane. Also Isaiah says 'Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself' (45^{15}).

[4] *E.g.*, That a stone is heavier than water.

[5] *E.g.*, That the part is less than the whole.

again, a non-scientific but incontrovertible piece of perception.

Apply this to the Personality of God, remembering how the strength of the perception grows with the strength of the personality. I think it is the blindness wrought by our sin which constantly robs us of this immediate awareness of God; for sin, as it were, breaks the spell. Some of the great saints have been near to experiencing it almost continuously, but we could not bear it, for its force would surely kill what spontaneity there is in our feeble discipleship.[1]

So let us say that we know God by a faith-judgment, roughly analogous to the ways in which we know much else in life, especially in the province of personal relations. And if a Nazi shall say 'I know my god in the same way,' let us apply our Lord's criterion, and ask what fruits He bears in His worshippers. That question is answered in Poland. But how, then, do I know that Christian love is a better[2] fruit than German 'Kultur'? Once again it cannot be proved, yet who does not know it? So once more I make my faith-judgment, and stand by it. And that is the last word.[3]

If my knowledge of God were a scientific-judgment or an instance of self-evident truth, my reason would thereby be compelled, and I should be in a spiritual necessity, a tyranny. But God does not want robots, but believers. He does not even want a St. Thomas.[4] He wants a St. Paul.[5]

[1] Cf. Ex 33^{20}.

[2] *I.e.*, *truer*—nearer to ultimate reality.

[3] Actually, for the scientist too, in so far as he has to assume by faith, both the validity of his sense-perceptions and rational processes, and the reliability of his experiments.

[4] Lk $20^{25.\ 29}$. [5] Ro $8^{24.\ 25}$.

Contributions and Comments.

British Israel.

With reference to the article in 'British Israel' in your current September issue by Rev. J. R. Coates, M.A., there is another argument which might also be used in condemnation of this Cult. It is an argument from archæology, and it is to the effect that no Semitic skulls have been found in any of the Barrows or other burying places of the ancient inhabitants of this island. There is no need to elaborate this archæological fact.

Henry R. Didcock.

Castleford, Yorks.

Another contributor sends the following points as worth adding to Mr. Coates' study of 'British Israel':

(1) The Anglo-Saxons were established in S. Scandinavia and the N. German coast between the Vistula and the Elbe by 1000 B.C., *i.e.* three centuries before the Israelite captivity. And the Celts were their neighbours at the same time.

(2) B.I. conception of prophecy is that of prediction, and is a survival of primitive religion, and is on the level of soothsaying and magic.

(3) B.I. contradicts the New Testament teaching that the Church is now the Israel of God. In fact, the only common point between B.I. and Christianity is that both use the Old Testament.

(4) What sort of a deity does B.I. offer for our love and worship? A being who wraps up a knowledge of the future in a kind of literary jig-saw puzzle for man to unravel, and who offers this puzzle, 2500 years before the time, as comfort to his chosen people when suffering invasion, exile, and great distress. In any case it is not 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,' not God as made known to us in Jesus. This objection is fundamental.

The Meaning of חֶסֶד.

In my note 'The Exegesis of Isaiah $40^{5.\ 6}$,'[1] I defended the Massoretic Text of Is 40^{6} in respect of the reading חסדו, maintaining that there is no need for any emendation. The word in this instance means 'reliability, steadfastness,' as the Targum alone realized with its 'all their strength.' The meaning of the prophet is that man's reliability is like the grass and the wild flowers, here to-day and gone to-morrow, never continuing in one stay, whereas the word of the Lord, by contrast, endures for ever, steadfast and sure, never failing.

It was said that this use of חסד is unique. It certainly is unique in respect of the varied attempts of the Versions to translate it, since none of them have their usual rendering for the word. It is unique also in that it is the one case where the word means 'reliability, steadfastness' without any admixture of 'kindness, mercy,' just as, at the other extreme, Est $2^{9.\ 17}$ are the only cases where the word means 'kindness' without any suggestion of 'steadfastness.' Usually the word, when used of God, refers to His 'covenanted mercies,' a phrase which meant more to a previous generation than unfortunately it does to the present, the outcome of His 'sure love.' This latter phrase was used by John Wesley in his

[1] Expository Times, lii. (1941), 394–6.

translation of von Zinzendorf's hymn 'Du ewiger Abgrund der seligen Liebe' (No. 63 in the *Methodist Hymn Book*, particularly *v.*[4]). Perhaps the phrase owes something to Is 55[3] and Ac 13[34], but the whole hymn with its full and complete recumbency upon the absolute steadfastness of Divine Grace is a true reflexion of the background of the word which we are discussing. 'Sure love' is, in general, a better rendering than G. A. Smith's 'leal-love,' which, as Dr. W. F. Lofthouse pointed out, 'is far too strong for most instances of its occurrence.'[1] Further, whilst the idea of a covenant is almost always necessarily involved, yet in most cases the meaning 'sure love' is that which is nearer to the mind of the writer. A good example of this is Ps 59[16] (Heb [17]), where the context is concerned with ideas of 'strength, high-tower, refuge.'

There are, however, two occurrences of the word where the context demands a larger element of 'firmness, steadfastness' than is usual. These are Jon 2[8] (Heb [9]) Ps 144[2]. Indeed, we find these cases to be closely allied to Is 40[6], though intermediate between that and the great body of the occurrences of the word. Qimchi explained these two cases on the analogy of Ps 59[17] ([18]), understanding them to be what Delitzsch called[2] 'a bold abbreviation of אלהי חסדי.' A third case which Qimchi mentioned was Ps 59[10] ([11]). This the Massoretes, by their *Qere*, had already assimilated to Qimchi's norm at the end of the psalm. If the Massoretes had left the text alone here, all would have been well with it, and the passage would have read '[My God (or perhaps 'God') will prevent (*i.e.* go before) me with his grace,' as Augustine interpreted it when he used the verse in connexion with the doctrine of Prevenient Grace. But evidently the Massoretes were influenced by the similarity of the previous verse in each case, and tried to restore something in the nature of a chorus, of which perhaps a relic is still to be found in the Arabic Version, where 'and my God' is added to the end of *v.*[9] ([10]). With respect to the last phrase in the verse, that norm both of the Massoretes and later of Qimchi, we suggest that it was an early gloss אלהי מחסי, 'my God is my refuge.' This was later corrupted into the present text, which Syriac, alone of the ancient Versions, reproduces. One MS. (Kenn. 76: a MS. with many curious variations) actually has מחסי. A division of the consonants into אלהים חסי provides the אלהים which lies behind both Jerome and the Targum,[3] and at the same time faces the scribe with חסי, in which he would find himself almost obliged to insert what he believed to be a missing *daleth*, because of the frequent occurrences of חסד in the psalm.

If the Massoretic Text at the end of the verse is to stand, then Luther's *mein gnadige Gott* is a sound translation. E. G. King's 'my merciful God' is more intelligible than the 'the God of my mercy' of R.V., but no more adequate. Oesterley's 'my loving God' is better, but, in our view, it needs supplementing with the idea of 'sureness.' 'My God of grace' is better still, for 'grace' has always in it more of certainty and sureness than 'mercy,' and it is that confidence and persistent strength which makes it so vital in the experience and vocabulary of Luther, and of all those who have found in him 'a schoolmaster to Christ.' A translation like Luther's makes good sense and is sound religion, so that no one would raise any objection to it, were it not that an examination of the Hebrew Text in conjunction with those of the ancient Versions shows complications which are not at first evident.

Ps 144[2]. Septuagint has the usual ἔλεος and Jerome, Vulgate the usual *misericordia*, reflected in the 'my loving kindness' of R.V., and in the 'my mercy' of the Douai Version. Syriac omitted it altogether. The difficulty, which is inherent in all four cases, is that 'my *chesed*' must be descriptive of the psalmist's attitude to some one else, whereas the context demands that it should be descriptive of God's attitude to the psalmist. This is the reason why an ordinary meaning of the word is inadmissible. The translation 'my mercy,' 'my loving kindness,' or '*mein Huld*' (Baethgen, though doubtfully, Kittel, Hans Schmidt) is therefore unsatisfactory, unless perchance it be taken to mean 'my merciful One,' *i.e.* the One who is merciful to me. But this definitely is not a translation of the Hebrew, since, whilst חסד can, and often does, stand for God's sure love for Israel, חסדי must mean 'my sure love for some one else' and not 'some one else's sure love for me.' The Targum realized that the word referred to God as the Agent, and therefore rendered it עבד טובי, 'the author of my prosperity,' which makes sense and would be quite satisfactory if only the word could mean 'prosperity.' But this it cannot do, in spite of Ps 23[6]. This is the intention, we may suppose, of Luther's *mein Güte*, *i.e.* 'the Source of my good,' but such a rendering is no more satisfactory here than it was in Is 40[6]. The 'my hope' of the Prayer Book is the brave best of a good man struggling with adversity, but it bears little relation to the actual Hebrew, Greek, or Latin. Most commentators, realizing that the Psalmist is referring to God and that some word meaning 'strength, confidence' is required by the context, have resorted to emendation, proposing חסני or חזקי or סלעי (cf. Moffatt 'crag'). If, however, as we hold, חסד can mean 'firmness, reliability,' then there is no need for any emendation in order to secure such a meaning, the Massoretic Text is sound, and the first word of the verse is, so to speak, the *feste*, whilst the second is the *Burg*, of Luther's *Ein' feste Burg*.

Jon 2[8] ([9]). R.V. has 'they that regard lying

[1] 'Hen and Hesed in the Old Testament,' in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, x. (1933), i. 33.

[2] *Commentary on the Psalms* (Eng. tr. 1894), iii. 380.

[3] Two Jerome MSS. (Add. 24142 and Harl. 2798–9, both in the British Museum) omit *Deus*, but this is probably an attempt to ease the situation caused by the transference of *fortitudo mea* from the beginning of the verse.

vanities forsake their own mercy.' Septuagint and Symmachus have the usual ἔλεος(ν), and Vulgate *misericordiam*, all with the third person pronominal adjective. The same objections apply to 'their mercy' here as to 'my mercy' in the previous case. Syriac cuts the knot and makes sense by changing the suffix and reading 'thy goodness.' Once again, a man can perhaps forsake *his* חסד to some one else, though the verb is not usual in this connexion, but he cannot forsake some one else's *chesed* to him. The Syriac, whilst sound enough theologically, could only be a sound translation if it were used in the sense 'Your Clemency,' the sense in which the actual Syriac word was used in addressing Byzantine emperors. G. A. Smith translates 'their covenant love,' and this makes sense, meaning that in having regard to vain idols they break their covenant with Jehovah and cease to be loyal to Him. Similar to this, but less accurate, is Duhm's suggestion 'their piety.' Other suggestions are 'their fortune' (Hitzig, Gunkel), 'their providence' (van Hoonacker), 'their best' (Wellhausen), all of which are comparable to Luther's *ihre Gnade*. But, as both Horton (*Century Bible*, 210) and Brewer (*ICC*, 47) have seen, the Hebrew word refers to something in which they have ceased to trust. Further, in as much as that which they have preferred is called הבלי־שוא, 'lying vanities' (Luther *dem Nichtigen*), Dt 32^{21}, with its parallel 'not-God,' would lead us to suppose that here the prophet intended the word חסד definitely to refer to Jehovah, the true God. Perhaps this is what Luther and van Hoonacker intended, but it cannot be got out of the Hebrew so long as the word is taken to mean 'mercy, loving kindness.' On the basis of the assumption that the prophet was referring to something (or some one) in which they have ceased to trust, the Targum has interpreted מאתר דאתוטב להון, 'from a place that has been made good for them,' whilst Marti, Brewer, and Moffatt ('their real refuge,' making the best, so to speak, of both worlds) favour the reading מחסתם, referring to Ps 144^{2}, the only other case which provides a close analogy. If, however, our argument in the previous case is allowed, then the Hebrew Text here also is sound, and the meaning is that they forsake their real and true ground of confidence, that sure love of God who alone is constant and steadfast and sure.

The conclusion of the matter is that God's love for His covenant-people is essentially sure, and that His Grace is nothing if it is not steadfast and certain, persistent, and prevenient.

NORMAN H. SNAITH.

Headingley College, Leeds.

John ix. 3.

MAY there not be another case of inaccurate punctuation in Jn 9^{3}? If we read—Οὔτε οὗτος ἥμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ. Ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, ἡμᾶς δεῖ κ.τ.λ.—some part at least of the difficulty of the passage is removed. Jesus then declines to discuss the suggested origin of the man's misfortune, and pointing out the opportunity which it presents, proceeds at once to its cure.

W. HERBERT SPENCER.

Duffield, Derby.

Matthew xiv. 12.

IN Mt 14^{12} the customary rendering is 'they (*i.e.* John's disciples) buried him and went and told Jesus. Now when Jesus heard it, he withdrew from thence in a boat.' Changing the punctuation, we get 'they buried him. And they (*i.e.* the Twelve) came and reported to Jesus.' In favour of this change, it must be pointed out that Matthew is here condensing Mark who has (Mk 6^{29}) 'his disciples . . . took up his corpse and laid it in a tomb. And the apostles gather themselves together and they told him all things, whatsoever they had done and whatsoever they had taught. And . . . they went away in the boat.' That καὶ may introduce a new paragraph may be seen in Mt 7^{28} 8^{9} 9^{35}. It is unnecessary to remark on the ambiguous ἐλθόντες ('came' or 'went'), the use by both Evangelists of ἀπήγγειλαν, which Matthew in 2^{8} and 28^{8} has without any definite object, and the fact that Matthew at this point begins his meticulous reproduction of St. Mark.

T. NICKLIN.

Ringwood, Hants.

Baptism for the Dead.

WHEN Dr. Badcock says, 'Apart from this particular verse (1 Co 15^{29}) there seems to be no trace of any such usage,' he must mean 'in the New Testament.' Eznik quotes the verse in his *Against the Sects*, Bk. iv. ch. 15, and adds, to use J. M. Schmid's translation, 'Ihr,' sagt er, 'saget, dass die Leiber, weil sie von der Materie sind, nicht auferstehen; wenn die sterblichen Leiber nicht auferstehen, warum sollen die lebendigen Seelen anstatt der todten Leiber Bekenntnis ablegen? oder weshalb sollen die sterblichen Leiber für die lebenden Seelen getauft werden, wenn, wie ihr saget, die sterblichen Leiber nicht auferstehen werden. So ist die Rede zu verstehen, und nicht wie Marcion fasselt, dass man anstatt des gestorbenen Katechumenen seinen lebenden Nächsten taufe, damit es ihm dort angerechnet werde, was auch die Marcioniten wirklich thun.' This fifth-century Armenian Father often uses 'Marcion' where we should say, 'the Marcionites,' but his words throw light on Marcionite practice as late as the middle of the fifth century.

C. S. C. WILLIAMS.

Oxford.

Baptism for the Dead.

IN his discussion of this question (1 Co 15^{29}) in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September 1943, Dr.

F. J. Badcock suggests a change in the punctuation of the passage, saying: 'I owe this suggestion to Sir Robert Anderson, but cannot now give the reference.'

The reference may be to Anderson's *The Bible or the Church?* (2nd ed.), where the passage is referred to in a note on p. 234, which ends thus:

> 'The solution of the enigma is to be found in correcting the punctuation. Verses 20–28 are in a separate paragraph. And resuming at verse 29 the argument of verse 19, the Apostle exclaims, "What shall they do who are baptized?" For while baptism connotes death it implies resurrection; and if this be gone both the blessing and even the meaning of the ordinance are gone with it. "It is for corpses if the dead rise not: why are they then baptized for them?" (See Dr. Bullinger's *Figures of Speech*, pp. 41–44.)'

Anderson's 'for corpses' is nearer the Greek ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν than is Dr. Badcock's 'into death'; but neither rendering takes account of the definite article before νεκρῶν. 'The article with νεκρῶν,' says Parry (Camb. Gk. Test., *ad loc.*), 'and the simple reference in αὐτῶν . . . alike prevent us taking the words to be merely=death, in relation to death'; and he adds: 'In fact, all such evasions are wholly due to the unwillingness to admit such a practice, and still more such a reference to it by S. Paul without condemnation.'

The case for changing the punctuation of Jn $7^{37f.}$, which Dr. Badcock adduces as a parallel, is on a different footing; the punctuation, 'He that is athirst let him come to me, and let him drink who believes in me,' is preferred by the oldest 'Western' authorities, and is intrinsically more probable, besides showing a characteristic poetical form with rhythm, parallelism, and (in the underlying Aramaic) rhyme.

F. F. Bruce.

University of Leeds.

Entre Nous.

George Adam Smith.

The eagerly awaited 'life' of Principal Sir *George Adam Smith* by his wife has appeared and will fulfil expectation. It is called 'A Personal Memoir and Family Chronicle' (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net) and this description is both apt and accurate. There is no attempt to assess the late Principal's contribution to scholarship, though this is indicated in general terms at many points in the story. But the book is a *story*—the story of a great and gracious personality, a scholar richly equipped by study and a strict conscience of duty, a mind almost incredibly fertile in ideas and projects, a character simple, sincere, reverent, humble and gay, and withal dowered by the chivalry and sympathy of the Prophets whom he loved to exalt and interpret. All this and far more is in the tender and faithful portrait which his wife has painted for us in a book which will be a continual delight to all who knew and revered its subject.

George Adam Smith used to walk three miles to school every day and on the way passed the manse of St. John's Church in Leith where a small boy, John Kelman, made faces at him from the garden. That is the starting point of a narrative which takes us rapidly through early years to the Aberdeen days in Queen's Cross Church, taking in the social work in the Pleasance district of which he said later, 'I always lift my hat when I pass Stevenlaw's Close. It's there I did my first mission work and met some of the poorest but the bravest people I have known, and learned more from them than they could have learned from me.' It was in these earlier days that he tramped over Palestine with an Arab muleteer as his sole companion, the first and not the least fruitful of his visits.

His ministry in Queen's Cross Church in Aberdeen was a remarkable one, not least for its emphasis on the pastoral side of his duty. He took his assistant with him on his visits, and once when he was visiting a very deaf man he shouted a prayer into his ear. When the prayer was over the old man turned to the assistant and said, 'Noo, come along and see if ye can pit up a prayer like yon.'

From Aberdeen he went to the Chair of Hebrew in Glasgow. It was a time of great unrest in the religious world when new ideas were met with unflinching opposition. Smith was regarded in some quarters as a dangerous man and indeed the very name of 'professor' was tainted, as he found when he made an expedition to the Highlands. He was passing a field where a woman was cutting rushes with a sickle. In his genial way he gave her greeting and she asked where he came from. On learning that it was Glasgow the woman exclaimed: 'That's where these professors live who say we are all descended from monkeys. Fine professors indeed! I wish I had one of them here,' as she brandished her weapon. The Professor found it desirable to beat a retreat.

It was a step, and a big one, from the Chair in Glasgow to the Principalship of Aberdeen University. There he had what was much less congenial to him, a multiplicity of administrative duties. An American definition of a Principal was that 'he is the circus and he is the band wagon and he is the dog under the wagon that does the yelping,' and that description appealed to the Principal's sense of humour. Lady Adam Smith puts the same thing in a slightly less picturesque way when she says that the Principalship required a scholar with an outlook far beyond his own range of subjects; a business man with a close grasp of detail; an organizer with shrewdness and foresight and an administrator to take and distribute

responsibility. It is a testimony to the many-sidedness and mental grasp of Smith that he was an undoubted success in his new sphere.

When one has mentioned his work as minister, as professor, as principal, one realizes that great tracts of his life have been left out. His numerous visits to America, for example, his beautiful home life, with its humours and its pieties, his notable friendships with great and famous people, and the honours that came to him thick and fast. I think at least five universities gave him a D.D. When he went to London to receive his knighthood his old gardener, on being asked where his master was, replied: 'He is awa sooth, to be benighted.' One honour that he specially valued was his election as a member of the Synthetic Society. It was a very exclusive corporation, containing men of widely different views, such as Canon Gore, A. J. Balfour, Lord Haldane, Sir Oliver Lodge, Baron von Hügel, Lord Hugh Cecil, Father Waggett.

This very welcome biography leaves on one's mind two main impressions. One is a remarkable achievement which must be reckoned to Sir George's credit. To an extent and in a fashion almost unique, he reconciled in his own person and labours the outlook of an advanced scientific scholar with the spirit of devout reverence and positive faith. Many men have contributed to this reconciliation in their measure, but few in the measure of this great scholar. The other impression is of a really great man. He had the humility of all great men, utterly free as he was from any trace of self-esteem or pride. Once during the last war when he had visited a hospital where a number of young officers lay wounded he said: 'I felt the long work of my life shrink to little in comparison with what any one of these men had done and borne in a few days or hours of their young lives.' That is a characteristic utterance. And the words of his devoted wife may fitly echo it: 'He never lost the humility and sweetness of his nature, there was no envy or self-esteem in it, only a great affection and reverence for all that was good in life.'

F. J. Rae.

Edinburgh.

Eivind Berggrav.

'With God in the Darkness.' 'In a forest cabin a few miles north of Oslo, Eivind Berggrav is held as prisoner, with twelve soldiers keeping guard. All Norway knows that he is there—the chief Bishop of the Norwegian Church' and it is from there that he led and leads his fellow churchmen.

'Norwegians are a strong, patriotic, and determined people in whose soul religion strikes deep. Most of their life is a struggle with Nature—the farmers struggle with the soil, the rocks, and the woods; the fishermen battle with the sea. Life is hard, death is not far away, courage and faith are unfailing.

'Here is a story from Bishop Berggrav's own tale of his life in his first diocese, Halogaland, in the far north, and of the building of a church.

'There is a little old fishing village on an island called Makkaur. It has no beach or harbour, only rocks and cliffs. . . . There are 102 people all told in the little village. . . . For generations the islanders had no church. But at last they built one for themselves. And it came about in this way. There was no earth in Makkaur. But about sixty years ago a fisherman named Hansen started carrying earth from the moors into Makkaur, a very little at a time. Then his wife, Peroline Hansen, joined him, and they went together by rowing-boat farther into the fiord and fetched load by load of earth, which they carried up the iron ladder on the cliffs, and gathered it together. After some years they had collected enough to feed one cow. The fisherman died, and his son and his wife went on in the same way till the field became large enough for two cows. But the old fisherman's wife decided that there must be a church. So she started quietly and cleared the ground beside the field, and one day she said to her son, "Here the Church shall stand." For the rest of her life she worked on, determined that before her son died the church should be built.

'And this is how the ceremony of consecration proceeded. The Bishop turned to Bernhard Hansen and said, "Go forward to the altar. Place the Bible on the ground on which your mother worked, and where she prayed that God's House should rise here in Makkaur." The old white-haired man, who was sitting with the Bible on his knee, raised himself slowly, and with great dignity walked slowly to the altar and carefully placed the Bible upon it.

'The Bishop went on, and turning to the children, said, "Children of Makkaur, take the baptismal bowl over which all the coming generations of children born in Makkaur shall be lifted, and carry it up to the font." Two girls, each ten years old, then walked through the church carrying the baptismal bowl between them and placed it on the font.

'Then the churchwarden, bidden by the Bishop, went forward to the altar with the holy vessels for the Lord's Supper.

'Then the Bishop cried, "Now we can light the candles in Makkaur church!" and, turning to the builder of the church, he said, "Master builder Aasjord, I know how carefully you have watched and worked over and blessed each of the planks that has been put together to make this house; I ask you to step forward and for the first time to light the altar candles in your chapel."

'Afterwards the Bishop baptized thirteen children, being 12 per cent of the whole population. Such is the spirit of the man who in these dark days has been sent by God to be Chief Shepherd of the Church of Norway.'[1]

[1] Eivind Berggrav, *With God in the Darkness*, 1.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.